


UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



109 633

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



172.4 W92
Kansas City^{v. 2}
Public Library



This Volume is for
REFERENCE USE ONLY

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

PUBLICATIONS OF THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

VOLUME II 1912

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
40 MT. VERNON STREET, BOSTON

Order of publication has controlled the arrangement of the table of contents.

Separate pamphlets to complete sets or for other purposes will be furnished on request up to the limit of the editions.

Beginning with 1913 publication of the Pamphlet Series is to be made monthly.

Neutralization : America's Opportunity.

By ERVING WINSLOW.

(With Bibliography.)

Pamphlet Series, July, 1912,
No. 6, Part II.

William T. Stead and His Peace Message.

By JAMES A. MACDONALD.

Pamphlet Series, July, 1912,
No. 6, Part III.

Educational Organizations Promoting International Friendship.

By LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Pamphlet Series, July, 1912,
No. 6, Part IV.

Revised List of Arbitration Treaties.

Pacts to which Pairs of Nations are Parties, with Statistics and Notes.

COMPILED BY DENYS P[ETER] MYERS.

Pamphlet Series, July, 1912,
No. 6, Part V.

Heroes of the Sea.

By W. M. THACKERAY.

Pamphlet Series, October, 1912,
No. 7, Part I.

The Forces that Make for Peace.

Addresses at the Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration, 1910
and 1911.

By HON. WILLIAM J[ENNINGS] BRYAN.

Pamphlet Series, October, 1912,
No. 7, Part II.

Foreign Missions and World Peace.

Address at Portland, Maine, October 10, 1912.

By SAMUEL B[ILLINGS] CAPEN,

President American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Pamphlet Series, October, 1912,
No. 7, Part III.

The Literature of the Peace Movement.

By EDWIN D[OAK] MEAD.

Pamphlet Series, October, 1912,
No. 7, Part IV.

The Waste of Militarism.

From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living, 1910.

Pamphlet Series, October, 1912,
No. 7, Part V.

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

CONCERNING SEA POWER

BY

DAVID STARR JORDAN

President Leland Stanford Jr. University

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

January, 1912, No. 4, Part I

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIRE EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE
Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES
Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR
By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR
London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION
By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

Without Serial Number

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM

From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29 A Beacon Street - - - - - Boston, Mass.

CONCERNING SEA POWER.*

BY DAVID STARR JORDAN.

The purpose of the vast naval expenditures of the world, over \$600,000,000 annually, is the development of sea power, as a factor in national strength. For this most of the nations, little and big, spend far more than the cost of all their civil equipment, extravagant as this often is. Its purpose is defined as (1) national defence, (2) the maintenance of peace, (3) marine insurances, the protection of commerce from pirates and belligerents, (4) the circumventing of the wicked schemes of designing nations, (5) the protection or subjugation of alien dependencies, and (6) the control of the sea.

The first item may be regarded as negligible, as fortified towns are impregnable to battleships, unfortified towns are now immune under the rules of war, and no army can subsist in an enemy's land without a tremendous train in the way of supplies. Since Napoleon's time, no army has lived on the enemy's country, because this country does not supply smokeless powder, the latest in muskets, machine guns, and modern rifles, nor the materials for disinfected camps and anti-septic surgery. No civilized nation anywhere really fears an attack from the sea. Even if commercial interests were not absolutely prohibitive, no warship can spend its costly equipment ravaging an enemy's coast. A great warship is good only for an hour's fighting. In real war, at the end of an hour, every ship must be sunk, victorious, captured, or run away. They cannot waste their costly strength on wanton mischief.

The second element we may neglect as a figure of speech. Sea power makes for peace through fear only, and the fear is strongest on the side having most machinery. On that side there is most to lose. Warships breed war-fears, and these sometimes materialize into real wars. Every organ demands its functional use, and the purpose of warships is war.

The third reason is based on passing conditions. Nowadays "trade follows the flag" only as the flag forces entrance into new abodes of savagery. Most savage races have been already exploited, and men are able to trade and to pray under police protection in almost every corner of the globe. This is the "Pax Britannica," the British Peace, which the whole world enjoys to-day, with variously alloyed satisfaction. Otherwise, the navy means little to commerce. The

*New York Independent, July 6, 1911.

trade of Norway and of Holland, without sea power, is greater per capita and in relation to wealth than that of Great Britain or Germany. Even the trade of Switzerland stands, in proportion, above that of the great seafaring nations.

The fourth reason given above involves the old fallacy that each nation is an individual, mean, brutal, grasping, ready at any instant to pounce on its unprepared neighbors. All this in face of the fact that nations are composed of multitudes of people, each with will and opinions of his own, and each intent on his own affairs, while no move of any importance can be made without their co-operation and consent. And, whatever else they want, they do not want war. Commerce in civilized nations is a mutual affair, and in almost every cargo that crosses the ocean men of all nationalities are interested. In the single matter of insurance the whole civilized world is bound together by the closest of ties. The cost of one warship would insure, in European insurance companies, all our seaboard towns against all accidents of war.

The fifth reason, the preservation of the Pax Britannica, and of its cousin the Pax Germanica and the maintenance of crown colonies and coaling stations, has been already noted. It does not take a thousand-million-dollar navy to accomplish this, and, if it did, it would not be worth while. Some good men have doubted whether it is worth while anyhow. Others have called it "the White Man's Burden," and have piously accepted it as part of the heavy weight of "Manifest Destiny."

The sixth reason rests on the perennial fallacy that sea power guarantees control of the sea. "Control of the sea" is a meaningless phrase, invented for the use of those interested in naval extension. No nation can ever control the sea. Its authority is bounded by the three-mile limit. The open sea is a highway belonging to all peoples alike. In time of war it may be a bit hazardous to vessels of belligerent nations. But war is not an enduring condition. It is now beyond the resources of any nation to carry on war with an equal nation for more than a few months. Then the lanes of traffic are open again, and cannot be closed except through commercial competition. This has nothing to do with sea power. The nation with the less sea power may have the greater elements of success in commerce.

To say that the United States must fight Japan for control of the sea, because Japan has subsidized a couple of transpacific steamship lines, as some of our armament promoters have claimed, is the acme of idiocy. There is nothing to fight over, and nothing is settled when the fight is done. The sea is still open to every comer, and there is space for a thousand merchant ships where one now exists.

Moreover, one of the next moves at the Hague Conference will be the neutralization of all merchant and passenger vessels. When this is done, war will no longer hold piracy in the long list of its evils.

Sea power is a device for doing injury at a distance. All such injury reacts on the nation which does it. Even bombarding a village of Senegambia costs more for powder than a dozen such villages are worth. The greater the sea power, the weaker the nation. The strength of a nation lies in paying its way. It is weakness to be in debt. In all society, in all history, the creditor controls the debtor. We are told, however, that the monstrous war debt of the nations of Europe is a blessing, because the interest money is paid out at home. The gold does not go out of the nation, to be sure, but there are nations within nations. A little group may be a parasite on a great one. It is true that the Rothschilds in London are recorded as English, those in Berlin as German, those in Paris as French. So with the other houses, a dozen or two, of the "Consortium" of bankers, the Unseen Empire of Finance. But in every nation this Consortium is an alien affair. Its members work together for themselves, and in no sense as a part of the nation in which their banks may be located. The Unseen Empire in each nation considers its own interests alone. Its business is to loan money to nations, the usury paid in advance, the bonds "absorbed" and placed where they will do the most good. The gold paid out in interest and usury does not leave the country. It merely flows from one class to another, from the pockets of the common man to the vaults of the powerful, from those who waste money to those who can make money work, in whose hands the confluence of a million little streams can swell to a great river. The progress of events drains the earnings of the common folk to build up this unseen enemy. And the great holdings in foreign lands possessed by the chief nations of Europe do not represent the people's savings. They represent the interest on war debts and armament loans voted by the people in excess of fear or of patriotism.

It is not by the wealth, the power, the enterprise, the culture even, of the few that the character of a nation should be judged, but by the opportunity it offers to the common man to make his life count, and by the power in the common to rise to opportunity. It is not true because "wealth accumulates" that "men decay." Men decay where wealth accumulates in the hands of those who have no constructive part in producing it. The parasites of a nation are no part of its actual life. The cancer victim does not rejoice in the vigor of the monster which devours his tissues.

In one of his many discussions of sea power, Admiral Mahan sug-

gests that the growing unwillingness of the people, the world over, to pay for it may be due to their "degeneration." Degeneration, as thus used, is a word without meaning. The only "national degeneration" known to science is found in the reduction of the average force of the units of which the nation is composed. The value of a nation depends on the value of these units. Such reduction can be due as a temporary matter to poverty or to failure in education; or, as a permanent matter, it may be due to emigration, to immigration, or to war. Emigration from many parts of the world has lowered the average at home by taking away the best. Immigration may lower the average in a land by filling it up with poorer stock, "the beaten men of the beaten races," in the continent from which they come. War destroys the strong and bold, leaving the weak and commonplace for the work of parentage. Everywhere and under all conditions, as war exists to-day, it brings about the reversal of selection.

We can find better explanations of the growing aversion of the people to borrowing more money for more sea power. Their growing poverty, on the one hand, their growing intelligence, on the other, and the increasingly murderous cost of the whole thing, seem to furnish adequate reasons. It may be true, as Admiral Mahan indicates, that the growing cost of armament no more than keeps pace with the increase of national wealth. Of whose wealth? The swollen wealth of those who produce these armaments and that of these people of no nation who loan the money these armaments cost. All these rest on the people's shoulders. In the long run it is the common man, the ultimate producer, the ultimate consumer, who pays for all. For all waste production and for all waste consumption the cost falls on the worker at last.

It would indeed be a sinister comment on our civilization if all the gains of science, invention, commerce, were to be swallowed up in more preparations for war.

The greater the sea power, the weaker the nation which buys it on borrowed money. It is agreed that to strengthen Great Britain's army would weaken her navy, even destroy her sea power. The greater the sea power, the greater the national debt. The weaker the nation, the greater her need of sea power. In these paradoxes we find a clew to the constant state of alarm in England, whose sea power outweighs that of all her rivals put together. She is weak, because her people have been strained past the limit. England is rich, if you look at her from above. The dukes got her land—for nothing and free of taxes—in the early merry days when a county was given to a favorite, free of taxation, except for his duty to raise so many troops on call. And from his duty these great Lords,

Westminster, Norfolk, Bedford, Cavendish, Devonshire, Argyle, Sutherland, and the rest, have been long since released. In spite of the menace of democracy, they still hold half of England in their grip. And the people cannot help themselves. Only 6 per cent. of the people of England make wills. The rest have nothing to leave.

The Unseen Empire of Finance has already "absorbed" and "distributed" \$26,000,000,000 of war bonds for the States of Europe. On this sum the people pay \$1,150,000,000 each year in interest. In their turn the bankers guarantee the peace of Europe. They will not let their debtors fight. Kipling tells us the story of Dives in hell, who was set free on condition that he would bring peace to all the nations. He sold them sea power and land power and imperial domination, and bound them in the bonds of debt so that they could not fight. This is a parable. His real name was not Dives, and he was not in hell when the story begins, merely in a dingy, high-gabled, seven-story building in the Judengasse at Frankfort-on-the-Main, a pawnbroker's shop with the sign of the Red Shield. From this he set forth to bring peace among the nations. He was at Waterloo, and he rode the wave of British gold which wrought the downfall of Napoleon. To him and to his assigns his Great Britain still pays \$150,000,000 interest money per year for his powerful assistance. His spirit still rules. He plays no favorites, and the armament syndicates know him as their best friend. He is still the "uncle of the kings."

Behind and beneath all this stand the people. They do not count for much in grand affairs, and their final end, according to Gambetta, is a "beggar crouching by a barrack door."

The defence our nations need is not protection from each other, but rather defence from the money-lender and from the armament syndicate.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

HALE—Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00

RALSTON—International Arbitral Law and Procedure.

Mailing price, \$2.20

SCOTT—American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.

Mailing price, \$1.65

MEAD—The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents

SCOTT—The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.

Mailing price, \$2.20

HULL—The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65

WALSH—The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents

DODGE—War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.

Mailing price, 60 cents

BRIDGMAN—World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents

WARNER—The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents

CHANNING—Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

SUMNER—Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

BLOCH—The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents

EVANS—Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40

REINSCH—Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65

BRIDGMAN—First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65

SPILLER—Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40

VON SUTTNER—Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00

The WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

BETHINK YOURSELVES!—By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents

A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University
of St. Andrews—By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents

ORGANIZE THE WORLD—By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid,
10 cents

PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A
Manual for Teachers—By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid,
20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

HEROES OF PEACE

BY

EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

January, 1912, No. 4, Part II

Entered as second-class matter, April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. See No. 6, Part V.
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD
Part IV. EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD
Part V. REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS

October, 1912

- No. 7. Part I. HEROES OF THE SEA. By W. M. THACKERAY
Part II. THE FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE. By Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

HEROES OF PEACE

By EDWIN D. MEAD

MR. CARNEGIE rendered no more signal service to the cause of peace when he provided for the erection of the splendid Temple of Peace at The Hague, as a fitting home for the International Tribunal, than when he provided, by his gift of five million dollars, for pensions for heroes of peace. The great service of this munificent endowment was in the new emphasis which it placed. It said that from now on the men who have shown their courage and devotion in saving life were to be applauded and rewarded as truly as the men who have destroyed life. It passed no judgment upon the battlefields of history. The generous giver, when he made his original and prophetic gift, doubtless felt, like others of us, that the battlefield has been the theater of infinite faithfulness, self-sacrifice, and service, of the highest heroism often as well as the deepest horror. But he clearly felt that the esteem and glorification of the soldier had been out of all proportion to the honor paid the heroes of other fields than the battlefield, whose service, done to no accompaniment of fife and drum or waving banners, often imposed far greater risk, demanded a far higher courage, and had a vastly nobler and more useful end. The time has come—it has been too long delayed—for a new adjustment, a distribution of honors and rewards upon a basis commensurate with our present actual civilization. The soldier who risks his life to save the state, or at the state's command, is a proper pensioner,

Reprinted from the *Outlook*, November 14, 1908.

but he is no more truly a public servant, nor the exponent or agent of patriotism, than the statesman or the teacher; and the policeman, the engineer, the fireman, and the surfman, faithful and firm at their dangerous posts, place us under equal obligation and deserve as well at our hands. Haltingly and at scattered points the community is beginning to recognize this fact. Until it recognizes it everywhere and in adequate measure, we are debtors to the generous individual pioneers who emphasize at cost the needed lesson.

The old saying of Andrew Fletcher, that he cared not who made the laws of the people if he might make the songs, is famous. A people's statues—their choice, or the choice imposed upon them, of the men to be publicly honored—are as important and influential as their songs; yet there is hardly any matter where the world is so backward, where it so seldom shows a high degree of enlightenment, where it is so often barbarous or snobbish. Contemplate the Duke of York's column (how many know what Duke of York?) and the Albert Memorial in London, yet without a monument to Shakespeare, and until yesterday without a statue of Milton or of Cromwell! Under my window in Boston was dedicated the other day a statue of General Banks. Still nearer my window is the great equestrian statue of General Hooker, quite dwarfing the modest figures of Daniel Webster and Horace Mann farther back in the Statehouse yard. Now, I have a very considerable respect for General Banks and General Hooker; but I cannot forget that there is no statue in Boston of Emerson or Lowell or Whittier or Longfellow, whom there is vastly higher reason, as there would be vastly greater benefit, for Boston to honor. There are statues of General Glover and Colonel Cass, of whose services not one reader in a thousand could give the slightest account; but there is no memorial of John Adams or John Quincy Adams, the two great Massachusetts presidents of the United States.

The case in our national capital is yet worse. The streets and squares of Washington swarm with statues; but it is no exaggeration to say that three quarters of them are of generals and admirals, and most of these men of whom even the high-school boys of the city know but little. There is next to nothing among them to remind the

visitor from Mars or from Maryland that the nation of Washington and Jefferson and Franklin—whose judgment of war and of the proper prominence of the soldier in their new Republic is remembered by some of us—ever produced a poet or historian, a scholar or teacher, a painter or sculptor, a philosopher or philanthropist, a statesman or a man of science worthy of notice, or that up to date it really honors, enough to spend any money to show it, any vocation save the warrior's. It is the measure of our barbarism.

Yet what opportunities and beckonings our rich American history and our national capital offer for the sculptor and the man of wealth and the proud nation! I do not forget the noble Washington monument, nor the noble memorials besides at the capital, and in New York and Boston and elsewhere. I am thinking of the things which are there and ought not to be, and of the things which ought to be there and are not. I am thinking how the great Scott monument glorifies Edinburgh, and the Luther monument glorifies Worms, and the Goethe and Schiller monument glorifies Weimar. At Rudolstadt, on the Thuringian border, we found in the little park a simple stone vase among the flowers, upon the pedestal of which, on the four sides, were inscribed the names of the great poets, Goethe, Schiller, and others, whose brief stays in the town had been memorable. The dates of their residence were given. Rudolstadt felt herself blessed by their sometime presence; and her beautiful recognition of it was a perennial refinement and refreshment for her people. I have suggested more than once two monumental groups which I should like to see erected in Boston,—the illustrious group of Boston men who, in the years before 1775, did so much to shape the American mind for independence, and the equally memorable group who, in the next century, did so much to rouse the nation against slavery. I should like to see, as well, in our Puritan City a monument to Puritanism. It should be a copy of that sturdy and beautiful old Norman chapel at Huntingdon, in which the boy Oliver Cromwell went to school, and within it statues and medallions in memory of all the great leaders of the Puritan movement, in commonwealth and church, in Old England and in New.

We are, of course, going to better the present order of things. The new teaching of history will help rapidly in this—in which in the last thirty years the old military monotony has yielded so signally to the varied and illuminating synthesis of the nation's political, religious, literary, scientific, and industrial life. Each of these realms, the young people and their elders come to see, has had its heroes, as heroic as any upon the Plains of Abraham or Bunker Hill or Look-out Mountain; and the heroes will not wait long for celebration. At the Old South Meetinghouse in Boston, a few years ago, one of our lecture courses for young people was devoted to "Heroes of Peace," and these were the heroes and heroisms honored, each by a lecture: "John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians"; "Horace Mann and his Work for Better Schools"; "Mary Lyon and her College for Girls"; "Elihu Burritt, the Learned Blacksmith"; "Peter Cooper, the Generous Giver"; "Dorothea Dix and her Errands of Mercy"; "General Armstrong and the Hampton Institute"; "Colonel Waring, and How he made New York Clean." The best thing about it was that the boys and girls, who do have a hunger and rightful claim for the chivalric and the stirring, but who are greatly wronged in the ascription to them of an absorbing love for blood and thunder, were, on the whole, more deeply interested in these heroes than in those of the War for Independence or the War for the Union, who never lack full justice from our hands at the Old South.

But I am not here concerned chiefly with famous men, even famous heroes of peace. "Let us praise famous men," says the writer of Ecclesiasticus, and he names many classes of them; but he hastens to remind us that there are humbler men who, in their places, are merciful and righteous and wise, but who so often "perish as though they had never been, and are become as though they had never been born." They "have no memorial," but they leave "a good inheritance," and "their glory shall not be blotted out." I think that in the future the mercy and righteousness and wisdom of humble men will have far more memorials than in the past; that moral character and social service, rather than power and show, will be what men and states will elect to honor. This is what democracy commands and what democracy means.

I have found in London this last summer some beautiful and eloquent public memorials of humbler heroes of peace, consummate illustrations of fortitude and self-sacrifice. They are memorials of a kind hardly ever seen before in human history; and they are a cheering earnest of the new emphasis which we shall see in ever greater fullness in the awards of honors, as the humane and discriminating spirit which begins to inform the world does its more and more perfect work.

I was returning to London from Surrey wanderings, in the course of which by interesting coincidence we had visited the country home and the grave of Watts, the painter, on the hillside close by the pretty little village of Compton, when on the train my eye caught a column in the day's London newspaper headed "Workaday Heroes." This was the opening paragraph of the impressive article:

If ever you need to remember that the age of chivalry is not yet dead, you should take a 'bus to the General Post Office. The building is, indeed, rather sedate than heroic, and the atmosphere unencouraging to roving fancy; but if you take your life in your hand and cross the road to St. Botolph's, you find birds chattering about grass and tree, a scrap of country in the swiftest whirl of the town, to make a vestibule for a simple shrine of noble deeds. One of the most English of modern poets has sung the honor "of lives obscurely great." He who would understand the spirit of England must go, not only to the temple of famous men at Westminster, but to the little red-roofed cloister in the Postmen's Park. In its midst, beneath the inscription "The Utmost for the Highest," stands a statuette of a bearded man with lofty brow, grave, long-robed; and below is written: "In Memoriam, George Frederick Watts, who, desiring to honor heroic self-sacrifice, placed these records here." There is space upon the walls for nearly a hundred and fifty tablets. Until last week only twenty-four places had been filled. The care of Mrs. Watts has now added another row of twenty-two, and the names to fill two more tablets have been chosen. The first jubilee of Queen Victoria was the occasion of Mr. Watts's suggesting a national memorial to the men and women who have lost their lives in saving life. He caused long researches to be made into the vast masses of newspapers in the British Museum, that such deeds might not linger in obscurity. A national memorial still remains nothing more than the noble idea of a great artist, but a modest part of his conception Mr. Watts himself made actual. He built in that "Postmen's Park" by St. Botolph's, which covers the site of the burial grounds of St. Botolph's itself, Christ Church, and St. Leonard's, the simple cloister, with

its dark bench and beams, floor of brick, and roof of tile, where the deeds of Londoners are enshrined. The first twenty-four tablets, many of which were in position before the painter's death, are of glazed white, bearing their simple inscriptions in dark blue letters. It would be hard to find material more pleasing in its effect or better adapted to withstand the ravages of the London atmosphere. The first act recorded is of the year 1863, the last of 1901. . . . All day long the birds flit to and fro in the cloister, and the plane trees rustle overhead, and away beyond the turf and the flame of the geraniums you may catch a soft gleam from the water of the old silent fountain. All day long the city workers come to sit in the shade, and rest, and read, and dream. What better shrine could there be for the heroes of the workaday world?

Truly an inspiring and compelling picture, this; and to old St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, I went on the next day. It is close by St. Paul's Cathedral, five minutes' walk northward; and the little cloister or loggia is at the farther end of the pretty green, with trees and flowers, beside the church. "Postmen's Park" the little ground is popularly called, because it is just beside the great Post-Office buildings, and I suppose the postmen, more perhaps than any other class of workers, —though plainly all classes like it, —are in the habit of resting there a bit at noonday after the luncheon hour. Visitors come and go; and many buy from the gardener the little book "In Commemoration of Heroic Self-Sacrifice," which he sells for a penny.

New tablets are added on the wall from time to time, several being placed, as above stated, last August. One tablet honors the heroism of a player in a pantomime at the Princess's Theater. The clothes of one of the actresses caught fire, and this other, Sarah Smith, ran to her to put out the flames, and succeeded, but was herself so terribly burned that in a day, after much suffering, she died. There are the names of Walter Peart and Henry Dean, driver and fireman of a Windsor express on which the connecting rod of the engine broke and tore the boiler asunder. In a deluge of flame and steam they stuck to their posts and stopped the train, saved their passengers, and met a terrible death. There is the tablet to Mary Rogers, the stewardess of the Channel Islands steamer *Stella*, which went down in 1899. When the last boat was pushing off, the sailors bade her jump in, but she answered, "No, no; if I get in the boat, it will sink. Good-by!

good-by!" She lifted her hands then, and cried, "Lord, have me!" And the *Stella* sank beneath her feet. There is the tablet to Alice Ayres, the maidservant in Southwark, who saved all her master's children from a fire at the cost of her own life:

"And who was Alice Ayres? you ask.
A household drudge who slaved all day,
Whose joyless years were one long task
On stinted food and scanty pay.
But neither hunger, toil, nor care
Could e'er a selfish thought instill,
Or quench a spirit born to dare,
Or freeze that English heart and will."

There are the names of two doctors who sacrificed their lives for their patients. There is the name of Solomon Galaman, the little East End boy of eleven, who saved his tiny brother from being run over in the crowded market street and fell himself beneath the wheels. "Mother," he said, as he lay dying, "mother, I saved him, but I could not save myself." The story of many another is equally heroic. The mere catalogue so deeply stirs the heart that I wish there were space here for every name and deed. The inscriptions on the tablets are the briefest; but in the little book Mrs. Watts has had the fuller stories printed, a page being devoted to each of those commemorated by the first twenty-four tablets. It is a veritable book of the ever-growing Bible, another Book of Acts—the acts of a fortunately monumented few whose names have been snatched almost by chance from among those of the unmonumented thousands who, through the generations, in their humble places, cheered by no trumpet and no hope of pension, have had the fibrous faith that made them faithful unto death, saving others because they would not save themselves. A benediction on George Frederick Watts and the St. Botolph's cloister—as it sheds benediction on London and on us!

About as far south of St. Paul's Cathedral as St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, is north, one comes to the Southwark Bridge over the Thames. Five minutes' walk beyond the southern end of the bridge is Southwark

Street. From Southwark Street leads black little Red Cross Street, and in Red Cross Street are Red Cross Garden and Hall. It is a historic neighborhood, if indeed a dull and dingy one. Shakespeare's Globe Theater once stood close by; and old St. Savior's Church, now the cathedral of the new diocese of Southwark, in which a beautiful window commemorates the fact that there John Harvard was baptized, is but five minutes' walk away. Dull and dingy the whole neighborhood certainly is—and Red Cross Street in particular; and it is a relief to turn from the street into the pretty green garden, with the picturesque little cottages and hall at the rear. This bright oasis in a desert was created twenty years ago by a group of devoted London people, and is held by a body of trustees, of whom Miss Octavia Hill is one. It is a means of grace to the whole region. The hall is used every Sunday in winter, and forms a beautiful free drawing-room for all who like to come; and it meets a hundred needs week after week. On alternate Sundays for many years one talented woman, Mrs. Marshall, has given concerts here of a fine character, every Christmas arranging a performance of the "Messiah," when all meet as at a religious service; and on Thursdays during the winter groups of friends give dramatic entertainments—the memorable opening entertainment, twenty years ago, having been by George MacDonald and his family, who acted "The Pilgrim's Progress."

But what chiefly drew me to Red Cross Hall, not this summer for the first time, were the panels painted by Walter Crane for its decoration, illustrative of the heroic deeds of the poor. There will be six of these panels altogether, and three of them have already been executed. One of the three is in memory of the same Alice Ayres, mentioned above, commemorated by one of the tablets in the St. Botolph's cloister. This memorial panel in Red Cross Hall gains added impressiveness from the fact that the heroic deed which it pictures was done in the immediate neighborhood. The young servant girl was sleeping in a room with the three children in the front of her master's house over the shop, when roused after midnight by cries of fire from a passer-by. The smoke was rising from the shop below. She ran with the baby in her arms, leading the other children, to wake her

master and mistress, and then hastened back with the children and threw open the window. By this time the shop was a mass of flames, and their retreat backward was cut off. The crowd called to Alice to jump or it would be too late, but through the fire and smoke she dragged one child and then another to rescue before she would think of herself, and then from a background of flame fell upon the railing below, with injuries from which, two days afterwards, she died.

This was in 1885. In 1887 a child barely five years old fell down a well 258 feet deep, near Basingstoke. By some miracle, just before reaching the bottom, where the water is twelve feet deep, he caught a rope and held on to it. His cries were heard, and one George Eales at once volunteered to go down the rope to rescue him. He reached the child, and, holding the rope with one hand, somehow managed to tie another rope around the child, and both were drawn up to the top. It is an almost incredible story of daring and endurance; and this deed is the subject of Walter Crane's second picture. The third commemorates the heroism of two navvies who, working with others upon the railway between Glasgow and Paisley, in 1876, stood back upon the approach of an express train, which upon passing would cross a lofty viaduct. Suddenly one saw that a sleeper had started, and that unless it was replaced the train would be wrecked upon the viaduct. "There was no time for words. Jamison made a sign to his nephew, and the two rushed forward; they fixed the sleeper, saved the train—and were left dead upon the line." One who was present at their funeral, which was largely attended, especially by fellow-workmen, wrote: "We laid them in the same grave in an old churchyard on a hillside that slopes down to the very edge of the railway. As the two biers were carried down the hill, the bearers being the friends and comrades of the dead, the trains were coming and going; and I thought of Tennyson's lines:

Let the feet of those he wrought for,
Let the tread of those he fought for,
Echo round his bones for evermore

Surely it is sacramental for the workaday folk of Southwark to gather in the presence of such memorials of workaday heroes as these, to

sing the "Messiah," or hear about "The Pilgrim's Progress," or talk together about coöperation. A benediction, too, on Walter Crane, and Octavia Hill, and Red Cross Hall! The thought of it transfigures that whole gloomy bailiwick in the Borough. I wish there were a similar Red Cross Hall in Boston, and in New York, and in Chicago.

Why do memorials such as these never find place in our Christian churches? I have visited more churches than most men in my time,—my friends are in the habit of saying that it is impossible for me to pass an English church, especially, without going in,—but I never saw a memorial like these in one, English or American, in all my life. The walls of English churches and cathedrals are rapidly becoming filled with ostentatious marbles and brasses—people are rich now, and our generation is lavish with monuments to contemporaries to a degree quite beyond our fathers—in memory of men who went out to South Africa the other day to kill brother men called Boers. I do not here discuss Boer War politics. I do not question that these were good men and true, faithful to their duty as they saw it, as honest fellows as their brothers yonder who faithfully killed them, and that they died bravely—Wellington said he never saw a man who was not brave. I only wonder whether their business was so much more Christlike than that of the navvy Jamison or Alice Ayres, so much better suited for celebration by Christian churches, that there is preëminent reason to celebrate it so pompously in that particular place, and the other not at all.

If Christ came to Margate, on the Kent shore at the mouth of the Thames, he would find what I call a truly Christian monument. It is what they call at Margate the Surf Memorial. It is the bronze statue of a man belonging to the life-saving service, peering anxiously out from the shore which he patrols into the dark mists above the angry sea, in whose breakers his fellow-men are in danger. Half a dozen of the Kentish surfmen lost their lives to save other lives in such a terrible ordeal a few years ago; and their names are inscribed upon the pedestal of this statue, which is their memorial. I do not remember their names, but they do not care for that—and it does not matter. All along the New England shore and the New

Jersey shore their brothers are pacing up and down to-night, under other names, keeping faithful watch through the darkness and the storm for the safety of your brother and mine. How often do we think of them in our quiet beds? One cry upon the midnight air, one rocket shooting yonder to the sky, and, spite of every pulling thought of the woman or the children in the home over the hill, the boat is launched against a fiercer foe than that which the "six hundred" faced at Balaklava, too often with a proportion of fatality as great. Too often, also, their names then remain written in sand or water. It would be well for us if, along with the names of infantrymen and cavalrymen and artillerymen, we could write them oftener in bronze and stone.

AT THE ARSENAL AT SPRINGFIELD

This is the Arsenal. From floor to ceiling,
Like a huge organ, rise the burnished arms;
But from their silent pipes no anthem pealing
Startles the villages with strange alarms.

Ah! what a sound will rise, how wild and dreary,
When the death-angel touches those swift keys!
What loud lament and dismal Miserere
Will mingle with their awful symphonies!

I hear even now the infinite fierce chorus,
The cries of agony, the endless groan,
Which, through the ages that have gone before us,
In long reverberations reach our own.

On helm and harness rings the Saxon hammer,
Through Cimbric forest roars the Norseman's song,
And loud, amid the universal clamor,
O'er distant deserts sounds the Tartar gong.

I hear the Florentine, who from his palace
Wheels out his battle-bell with dreadful din,
And Aztec priests upon their teocallis
Beat the wild war-drums made of serpent's skin;

The tumult of each sacked and burning village;
The shout that every prayer for mercy drowns;
The soldiers' revels in the midst of pillage;
The wail of famine in beleaguered towns;

The bursting shell, the gateway wrenched asunder,
The rattling musketry, the clashing blade;
And ever and anon, in tones of thunder
The diapason of the cannonade.

Is it, O man, with such discordant noises,
With such accursed instruments as these,
Thou drownest Nature's sweet and kindly voices,
And jarrest the celestial harmonies?

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts:

The warrior's name would be a name abhorred!
And every nation, that should lift again
Its hand against a brother, on its forehead
Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain!

Down the dark future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease;
And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, "Peace!"

Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of War's great organ shakes the skies!
But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise. — *Longfellow*

THE FATHERLAND

Where is the true man's fatherland?
Is it where he by chance is born?
Doth not the yearning spirit scorn
In such scant borders to be spanned?
Oh yes! his fatherland must be
As the blue heaven wide and free!

Is it alone where freedom is,
Where God is God and man is man?
Doth he not claim a broader span
For the soul's love of home than this?
Oh yes! his fatherland must be
As the blue heaven wide and free!

Where'er a human heart doth wear
Joy's myrtle-wreath or sorrow's gyves,
Where'er a human spirit strives
After a life more true and fair,
There is the true man's birthplace grand,
His is a world-wide fatherland!

Where'er a single slave doth pine,
Where'er one man may help another, —
Thank God for such a birthright, brother, —
That spot of earth is thine and mine!
There is the true man's birthplace grand,
His is a world-wide fatherland! — *Lowell*

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid	\$0.60
AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid	1.65
DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+229 pages. Postpaid	.60
THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid	.55
THE FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid	1.65
FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid	3.50
THE FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid	.65
THE GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid	.55
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid	2.20
INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid	2.40
MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid	1.00
THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSH. 8vo, xliii+462 pages. Postpaid	.90
PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+180 pages. Postpaid	1.65
SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid	1.40
TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid	2.20
THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid	1.65
WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid	.60
WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid	.60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By LEO TOLSTOI. 6½ x 4½ in., 50 pages. Postpaid	\$0.10
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6½ x 4½ in., 82 pages. Postpaid	.15
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 76 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid	.10
A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid	.10
ORGANIZE THE WORLD. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 7½ x 5½ in., 36 pages. Postpaid	.10
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6½ x 4½ in., 125 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 132 pages. Postpaid	.20
WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 107 pages. Postpaid	.20

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

INTERNATIONAL GOOD-WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES

BY
REV. WILLIAM C. GANNETT

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

JANUARY, 1912, No. 4, PART III

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

HALE—Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00

RALSTON—International Arbitral Law and Procedure.

Mailing price, \$2.20

SCOTT—American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.

Mailing price, \$1.65

MEAD—The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents

SCOTT—The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.

Mailing price, \$2.20

HULL—The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65

WALSH—The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents

DODGE—War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.

Mailing price, 60 cents

BRIDGMAN—World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents

WARNER—The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents

CHANNING—Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

SUMNER—Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

BLOCH—The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents

EVANS—Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40

REINSCH—Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65

BRIDGMAN—First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65

SPILLER—Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40

VON SUTTNER—Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00

The WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

BETHINK YOURSELVES!—By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents

A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University
of St. Andrews—By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents

ORGANIZE THE WORLD—By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid,
10 cents

PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A
Manual for Teachers—By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid,
20 cents

INTERNATIONAL GOOD-WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES.

BY WILLIAM C. GANNETT.*

Lovers of peace in these days have much to be thankful for, but they have little reason for believing that their hopes are close to fulfilment. While the situation to-day is tragic, the mere paradox of it is interesting. The ex-President, whose jest about the Spanish War was that "there was not enough of it to go round," and whose permanent sermon, ringing over the land, has had for its text, "In time of peace prepare for war," and whose principles, could they be embodied in bronze, would set up in the Capital a statue of *Jesus armed to the teeth*, and *still* called "the Prince of Peace and Good-will,"—this ex-President is the same of whom it was truly said that "he sheathed the swords of a million men" by the treaty he brought about on the island in Portsmouth Harbor, and who won the Nobel peace-prize for his feat, and who, if I remember aright, devoted his prize, the \$40,000, to plans for the conciliation of Labor and Capital. Roosevelt represents, within the bounds of his own personality and action, the peace-and-war paradox of the time in which we are living.

Write that paradox large, and it becomes terrific in terms like these:—

The years in which we are living are bristling and exploding with war-tension. Though the movement for peace found its Year of the Lord and began a new era with the First Conference of the Hague in 1899, we have to remember with shame that America came to that Conference, her hands red with the blood of a little Philippine people who were resisting our war of conquest; only one month between,—not long enough to wash them

* Address before the National Unitarian Conference, Washington, D.C., October 24, 1911.

clean. Our Beautiful One came to that Conference a Lady Macbeth! "Here's the smell of the blood still: all the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand. Who would have thought the small people to have had so much blood in them?" We have to remember that England went home from that Conference—not three months between—to plunge into her South African war with another small people. And that before the Second Hague Conference met, Russia, she who summoned the nations to these Councils of Peace, had reeled under crushing disaster in another war motivated by conquest; and that her victor, Japan, was absorbing soft Korea as an amoeba its prey. We have to recall that, as the Second Conference gathered in 1907, France was busy securing "influence," as the first step is called, in Morocco; and that, in the quick years since then, Austria has seized the two little provinces, France and Germany have been growling over their bone in Morocco, and now Italy has startled all Europe to its feet in alarm, and braved the title "Brigand," if she have not out-Turked the Turks, by her dealings in Tripoli.

Never, too, never in human history has the burden of simply keeping the peace between non-fighting nations been so heavy and grievous as during these same dozen years,—“the whole [civilized!] creation groaning and travailing in pain together until now.” Peace itself has become a tragedy. The frenzied race between England and Germany in the building of battleships has been on until both nations are panting with financial exhaustion,—and no stop in sight. Neighbor nations, catching the infection, have ordered their battleships. Nations over the sea catch it,—Argentina, Chili, Brazil. Even we, triply safe in our distance, our strength, and in the world's favor, have caught the madness and entered the race. Thirteen years ago, through the nineties till 1898, our army was averaging a cost of fifty millions a year: now the fifty are doubled. Thirteen years ago our navy was costing an average of thirty millions a year: now it costs more than quadruple that. What has happened to make the difference? Nothing has happened but that little war of which “there wasn't enough to go round,” but

of which there was plenty to print the word "Imperialism" over the word "Democracy" on our banners, and plenty to expose us as never before both to national temptation and to national peril. Absolutely nothing has happened but that, to make a difference; that accounts for it all. No one has attacked us, no one has insulted us. Thirteen years of profound peace between us and the rest of the world; thirteen years of better liking by the nations than perhaps ever yet in our history; thirteen years of wonderful growth; yet, pricked by new fears, we, too, have shared in the panic and caught the frenzy of battleship building. To that doubled and quadrupled budget for army and navy add the hundred and fifty millions for pensions, and it ranges about 70 per cent. of our national revenue to-day going to pay for war,—the consequences of past war and precautions against improbable new ones. 70 per cent. of the national income for war,—and not an enemy in the world! It is as if a man, well liked of his neighbors, were earning \$1,000 a year, and spending \$700 of it regularly to pay "for old, unhappy, far-off things," and quarrels long ago, and to keep himself safe should new quarrels arise,—\$700 for this, and \$300 for shelter and food and clothing and education and pleasure and the children. Our huge national debt of \$1,300,000,000 or so,—and it is not half what it was on the day when Grant said, "Let us have peace!"—is *wholly* a creation of war. It is the remainder debt of the Mexican, the Civil, the Spanish American Wars, the three together lasting less than eight years of our national life.

This is one side of the paradox in which we are living to-day, with illustration from home life.

Nevertheless—and this is the other side—nevertheless, our claim is that the twentieth century is destined to organize nations in relations of peace and good-will. In the sense in which, speaking broadly, the fifteenth, the sixteenth, the seventeenth, the eighteenth, the nineteenth centuries were each the exponent of one or two dominant ideas and achievements in social advance, this

twentieth century of ours is likely—is sure, as some of us think—to become the century of *world-organization* far and away beyond all previous centuries. Never before such keen perception of war's human and economic *wastes* as to-day! Never such realization of its varied *insanities*, and of the impossibility of maintaining peace as we have been trying to maintain it by heavier and heavier armaments! Never such trenchant exposure of traditional "*illusions*" that underlie war,—illusions of "honor" therein, illusions of "profit" thereby! Never before such powerful forces combining in commerce, in industry, in science, all working unconsciously for peace, as to-day. The vast ramifications of the credit system during this last generation, the credit system on which all commerce is now based, are almost enough by themselves to arrest war to-day. The change from visible bullion to invisible credit as the basis of trade means such complex, intricate, sensitive, ethicalized, spiritualized inter-relations of nation with nation, that to-day a war-shock in any corner of Europe shows itself in radiations felt throughout the exchanges and markets of two continents. That is "*civilization*,"—to feel the brother's ache in our own side, whether we will or no. It is "*Christian*" civilization when we *want* to feel it there, and govern our actions accordingly. But this change in the basis of trade makes the whole economics of war very different from those economics a hundred, or fifty, or even thirty years ago; and the colonels and jingoes of the land, and half of the editors, haven't yet found this out. (Read Norman Angell's "*The Great Illusion*," to know what I mean.) The bankers to-day can lay hand on the shoulders of emperors, and say, "Hold!" It is whispered that they did lay hand on Emperor William's shoulder only a month ago,—and the Moroccan situation suddenly cleared. Four new phases of civilization—these widening ramifications of credit and capital, the bankrupting of nations by the enormous costs of the modern armed peace, the perfecting of agents of ordinary destruction into agents of annihilation, and the apparition of the air-ship, suggesting changes in warfare as momentous as those which the invention of gun-powder wrought five hundred years

ago—are contemporaneous phenomena of our own generation; and they all make strongly for peace.

Such agencies, perhaps the mightiest of all, are the *unconscious* promoters of peace. Count also the *sub-conscious* agencies,—the rise of woman, the rise of trades-unions, the rise of socialism, the widening and deepening democracy. Suffragette or not, member of unions or not, socialist or not, democrat or not, we may greet all of these movements as re-inforcements in the war against war.

Time fails to count the *conscious* agents working for peace,—the associations of noble men and women who are planning, persuading, resolving, enacting together in this behalf to-day. You must ask Edwin Mead of Boston or his wife, our General Peace Secretaries, for the list; or read Mr. Mead's address on "International Organization" before the Congress of Races in London last summer. Take such facts as these. There are about three hundred associations to-day discussing and studying the principles of international law. The Inter-parliamentary Union—and that means the combined brains of the statesmen of the civilized nations—has twenty-five hundred members. And there are the great recurrent Peace Congresses, both national and international, and the veteran Peace Societies that have grown gray in their noble service. And there are the Smileys, two of them still with us, and their Mohonk Conferences; and Edwin Ginn's "World Peace Foundation"; and, here in Washington, Carnegie's ten million Endowment for the advancement of peace, whose programme is even now in the printer's hands, and whose work is to be the scientific study of the five C's,—the causes, conditions, costs, consequences, and cures of war. Ten millions for that,—isn't it splendid? Yet it isn't the cost of one battleship! And there, above all, are the Hague Conferences, with all that has come and is to come out of them in the way of national treaties and arbitrations and the judicial and legal organization of peace.

This is the other side of the paradox in which we are living to-day.

And what is the result of it all? A conviction, spreading wider and wider, that war to-day is an anachronism,—not a glory, not an inevitability, not a profit, and not merely a waste and a horror, but an anachronism, a superstition, an illusion; if Moltke is to be trusted,—and he said it when Germany had won the two provinces, and was writhing in the pain of digesting the billion of dollars indemnity bitten from France,—an experience that even to the victor “costs more than it brings”; a disgrace to person or paper or party or people that hurrahs for it; and in almost all cases a national crime on the part of the nation beginning it. The indictment can hardly be drawn too severely against war to-day. Conceding the naturalness of war under savage and barbarian conditions, and the good that it may have done in the past by caking the nations together, by broadcasting seeds of civilization (Alexander Grecizing the East, Rome giving laws to the West), in withstanding oppression, in developing the virtues of courage and loyalty and self-sacrifice and co-operation,—conceding all this, as we must,—and thank God that we can trace good coming out of an infinite woe!—the new conviction is that *now* war as a method of reaching these good ends is becoming an anachronism, and that the soldier *as soldier* is becoming a rudimentary organ in the body politic, hardly honorable any longer as member; pitiful, rather, and even a danger,—like an appendix. These vast buildings here of the War, the Navy, the Pension Departments, represent the *has-been*, not the *to-be*, of human development. It is the other departments and buildings that are prophetic, creative. We shall not forget the men who have died for us in battles; but who can believe that at the end of the century, as now at its beginning, five of each seven of the statues in Washington will be those of men who have dared or died for us *thus*? A great and good soldier, one of our own, said frankly, “War is hell”; and we read on his monument in yonder park the words, “War’s legitimate object is more perfect peace.” The line would be nobler had he said, “War’s *only* legitimate object is more perfect peace.” But even that would be saying that hell’s

only legitimate object is more perfect heaven,—which is so; and, as Sherman probably knew, hell is a temporary, not an eternal, affair.

It is all a question of evolution and the time of day. It is growing late to take the hell way to heaven. *To-day is to-day, and we are living in to-day. War was yesterday's way.* There's a new preposition creeping into the language, or rather, an old preposition creating new prefixes,—the preposition "inter." It is coming into the language because its significance is coming into consciousness as never before,—intercourse, intercommunication, interdependence, interstate, international, interracial even. These words and conceptions are growing familiar, and together they mean,—World-peace is coming! Apart from religion, patriotism has been deemed the noblest virtue to which appeal can be made in the case of the average man. Again and again it has lifted him high out of self. But also again and again and again it has acted to drag men down from a still higher loyalty. Let patriotism call, and the best manhood in each of two facing nations has felt it "duty" to do many things which it would lay down life *rather* than do, apart from that call. We are passing out of that stage. To-day the best manhood is beginning to understand that patriotism, to be *true* patriotism, has to be—may we not call it?—*inter-patriotism*; that to say, where other countries are involved, "My country, right or wrong," is to say, "My country, whether God will or no"; and that the God who taketh up the isles as a very little thing and counteth the nations as the small dust of the balance provides that such patriotism sooner or later brings sorrow and shame to the country beloved. Patriotism to-day demands the new prefix. All the good things and great are showing themselves inter-patriot. Science, industry, commerce, economics, literature, are all internationals. Of course ethics is, always has been, and must be. It follows that politics must be, for politics is only ethics applied in the making of history; and when politics learns this, war—war will become the patter of rain-drops after the departing storm.

The organization of the world in relations of peace and good-will! It is no longer a dream, it is a beginning. More than in any other specific direction, I said, we are looking toward the Hague to discern that beginning. Anything seen there at present is, and can be, no more than beginning. But, looking from the Hague Conferences onward, we think we can see clearly five steps in the coming organization:—

First. The International Court of Arbitral Justice, already existing in embryo, and even in that condition with six international quarrels settled by it; but not such a court as now, summoned with difficulty and only at pleasure of disputants,—not that, but one in permanent session, with regular procedure, and regular judges, and easy of access. The nations, meanwhile, are making treaties of pledge with each other to refer to its final adjudication their questions of difference,—even those involving “honor and vital interests,” if President Taft has his way. All blessing upon him! Between the two Conferences already held thirty-three separate treaties of “obligatory” arbitration for certain classes of dispute were registered, and two of these made by Denmark, one with the Netherlands, one with Italy, stipulated arbitration for *all* differences without exception. Little Denmark was six years ahead of our big President. By the end of 1909 the number of arbitral agreements had grown to two hundred and eighty-eight. (I quote Ambassador Hill, who was part of the events he describes in his new book called “World Organization and the Modern State.”)

Second. An International Congress, like the present Interparliamentary Union, but official, with regular sessions, and with members delegated by the nations to represent them; its work to be the discussion and shaping and recommendation of measures that make for the common weal of the world.

Third. A Code of International Laws, gradually evolved from the decisions of the International Court and the recommendations of the International Congress. Mr. Hill reminds us that “the price of a single battleship has never yet been expended by *all the nations of*

the earth combined for the judicial organization of peace." Folly? Yes; and what in such matter was folly yesterday and insanity to-day is to-morrow criminality. If ten Powers—England, France, Germany, Russia, Austria, Italy, the United States, the South American Republics as a group, China, Japan—were to contribute each *one-tenth* of a battleship's cost to endow at The Hague the Arbitral Court of the Nations and a Commission on the Codification of World Law, that one-tenth apiece would save whole fleets of battleships on the seas, and promote more happiness on the earth than probably any other million which any of those nations ever has spent, or could spend to-day.

Fourth. The Establishment of an International Police, —an international army and navy, with constituents furnished by nations in league for the purpose; at first by a few, and then by more; at first having very limited and then with widening functions, all under treaty arrangements. A police system is needed by the world, and, until something international of the kind is created, it is hard to see how, with the nations under present conditions of distrust, disarmament on any large scale can be effected. It may not be so far off as we think, the day for this international police in place of the separate armies and navies with their ruinous cost. Even Sir Edward Grey, in responding to President Taft's proposal, ventured to predict it. One or two hundred policemen, with three or four courts and a jail, are enough to represent all the force-element necessary to maintain justice in huge communities of hundreds of thousands of citizens. Peace rules between them, order is kept, the rogues are awed, the criminals are held at bay, and measures for the common good are carried out, because the public opinion of the whole community is back of the tiny blue-coat army that wears the buttons and carries the night-stick of authority. A small army, a small navy, with the united strength of the great Powers behind them, would insure national protection and the world's peace more effectively, and with incomparably less cost to humanity, than the rival armies and navies

that now strut and sidle and growl and dare each other to cross the boundary lines.

Fifth. An International Protectorate; that is, the employment of the joint public opinion of the nations thus organized, and, when necessary, employment of the International Police, as a Protectorate against national crimes. Under such a Protectorate we may look for a great extension of three international methods of maintaining peace in the world,—Mediation, Intervention, and the Neutralization of nations and territories.

Call this a dream, if you will. The soldiers will. Half the diplomatists will. Politicians will, unless they are statesmen. Many, not all, of the business men will. *Most* of us will. But some of us will add, "A dream that is even now beginning to come true, and which the twentieth century will carry far towards fulfilment." The years will decide.

Meanwhile, under all such organization lies the spirit which alone makes it possible: the growing spirit of justice and good-will in the world, and the growing faith in moral law as really controlling progress and destiny. *Spirit and faith*, I say. These are terms of personality. In this age of growing "social consciousness," can we not realize that the State is a "person," a communal person? It has a kind of unitary self-consciousness. It has mind. It has temperament. It has sentiments. It has conscience. It has will. It has character. It is a joke, but not a mere joke, to say "Uncle Sam" and "John Bull." The very phrase, "a nation's honor," is an assertion of moral personality; and, if honor is a quality to be defended and maintained against others, it is a quality to be exercised towards others. Of course, a State has body and hands, and can act. It grows, like a person,—is a child, an adolescent, mature, sometimes senile. The trouble with most States is that the period of childhood and egoism and impetuosity lingers; adolescence has not brought them to self-control and to altruism. And the State lives as a communal person among other communal persons, sister nations, in relation to whom it has rights, in relation to whom it has obligations

and duties. It feels good-will and ill-will. It can indulge in suspicion, resentment, passion, injustice towards them, and it can train itself in feeling and self-control to acts of trust and good-will and generosity and love. It can learn to recognize the essential unity of itself and its fellows as *man-kinned*, and the solidarity of their interests, and the supremacy of a Law of Justice and Good-will binding on all, and which, when obeyed, binds all together in higher and higher conditions of civilization and happiness.

It is time to apply this conception of the State as a "person" to all inter-relations of the nations with each other. Peace and war are fundamentally questions of spirit. Secretary Root was right when he said, as he laid the corner-stone of the building for the International Union of American Republics: "There are no international controversies so serious that they cannot be settled peaceably, if both parties really desire peaceable settlement; while there are few causes of dispute so trifling that they cannot be made the occasion of war, if either party really desires war. The matters in dispute between nations are nothing: the spirit which deals with them is everything." The relations that have lasted a century between England and America prove the secretary right. A hundred years of peace, and most of them years of growing friendship! 1915 brings the centenary of that friendship, as also it does of the American Peace Societies. Yet, as ex-Secretary Foster points out, in that hundred years there have been eight differences with England, each of which might have easily brought on war, had the "spirit" of war been present deciding the issues. Just before the hundred years began there was a difference that did bring a war,—that of 1812,—in consequence of our own precipitate action. Though not without long provocation, that war, when it came, was a war of boyishness and ignorance of conditions; much as our last—the Spanish-American—was. Two days before the first was declared, the English Orders in Council, which, by authorizing capture of neutral American ships, had been the main cause of trouble, had been repealed,—and we did not know it. A telegram,

could one then have been sent, would have probably saved the War of 1812! A very little more patience might have saved the War of 1898! "The matters in dispute are nothing. The spirit which deals with them, everything."

If with England, why not with other nations such friendship? Why not with all? Why should there not be a nation known, the world round, for good-will as well as for justice,—known as a "lovable" nation? Why should there not be many such? Herbert Spencer observes in his grave and sensible way: "All conduct themselves with more than usual amiability to a person who hourly discloses a lovable nature. Such a one is practically surrounded by a world of better people than one who is less attractive." Might that not be true of a nation? and wouldn't it be? "All nations conduct themselves with more than usual amiability to a nation who yearly discloses a lovable nature. Such a one is practically surrounded by a world of better people than one who is less attractive." Why should not the United States become a lovable nation *by* loving? And find stronger walls of protection in the good-will that the peoples bear to it, because it bears good-will to them,—stronger walls in this than any it can find in its armies and navies? The perfect conquest of a foe is to convert him into a friend. That adds his strength to ours and our strength to his as protection to both. Something like this is already true of our country, I think. Whatever our faults, the peoples do trust us, do expect the right and generous thing of us, more than of most.

But higher acts of faith in the right, and of loyalty to it, than any we yet have dared it will take before we can stand in the world a thoroughly lovable or even trustable nation. We need a spirit of justice that will arbitrate all, really *all* sources of difference,—not excepting the question of the Panama Canal strip, while Colombia questions our "right" to it, President Roosevelt! Not excepting the Monroe Doctrine, because it is nearly a hundred years old, if the peoples, especially those of

the two other Americas, dispute our "right" in that doctrine, President Taft! Not until people and presidents are ready to submit *such* questions to arbitration is our President's suggestion as nobly complete as it should be. We need a spirit of honor that always, without debate or demur, as of instinct, will follow the lofty course of Roosevelt in returning the surplus indemnity to China,—an act which did more to strengthen us in the Pacific, and more for the peace of the future, than all the battleships built or projected in his two terms. *There* acted the honest, chivalric, far-seeing statesman! We need the sympathy that sweeps on the instant to rescue, whenever a community staggers under a blow of Nature,—as we did for Messina but lately; as the world did for us when Chicago went up in flames, and when San Francisco toppled in ruins. And against the old doctrine that "Might makes Right" between nations, we need the faith that, at last, Right is making for Might in the world, and that good-will and trust are better protectors to-day than armies recruited by fear and distrust.

In this spirit of trust we, the United States, should be willing seriously to consider neutralizing the Philippine Islands and the Panama Canal. Had we faith and daring for *that*, it might set the world's peace movement forward by one hundred years! It would be the equivalent, on our part, of England's, Germany's, Russia's partial disarmament. Courage, indeed, it would take, with somewhat of repentance, and much of self-mastery, and total abandonment of the conqueror's claim that we own those Islands and Islanders, to place the Philippines by neutralization under a joint protectorate of the strong World Powers. Danger therein? Yes; and is our present occupancy there devoid of it? Are not those distant islands our weakest point, the most inviting to attack, the hardest to defend, the most costly to hold? And what radiations of good would come of the deed! It would confirm to us the good-will of the nations, their trust in America, and so turn the Islands from a peril into a security for us. It would key up our national conscience, and strengthen us for leadership in other movements making

for righteousness and peace among men. It would insure greater safety to all other little peoples on earth against oppression by the strong; for the act would raise the standard everywhere of international justice.

And the Panama Canal. Protection it must have,—would not the joined hands of the nations that are to enjoy its benefits give it? Courage, again, it would take to-day, for such trust as that in moral forces; and higher reaches of statemanship than are often attained might be needed to accomplish the neutralization successfully. Yet, planned wisely, the whole world looking on, while the great Powers pledged their honor to the sacred task, that act of trust and generosity would probably protect our canal more effectively in the years to come, and with far less of danger, anxiety and cost, than any attempt by its builders to Americanize it and maintain their rights by force against hostile comers. Why? Because in the long years the world's good-will is stronger protection than armies and navies. And, again, what results in world-welfare might follow a Convention representing the nations, summoned by the United States to counsel together that the wedding of the Atlantic and the Pacific should mean Jubilee to all the earth!

To be a nation beloved, with justice, honor, sympathy, trust, even as great as I picture them here, is a consummation nearing possibility to-day. Who should dare the difficult paths of nobler international ethics, if not we? By our protected position on the young continent, by our freedom from traditions of history that keep Europe in bondage, by our unique discipline and long-tested experience as a Union of States, it is laid upon us, yea, upon *us*, to lead the world to its twentieth-century task.

“And thou, O my Country, from many made one,
Last born of the nations, at morning thy sun,
Arise to the place thou art given to fill,
And lead the world-triumph of peace and good-will!”

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS

A SERIES OF TABLES
SHOWING
THEIR PRESENT COST, THEIR GROWTH IN THIRTY YEARS
AND
THEIR RELATION TO NATIONAL INDEBTEDNESS

PREPARED BY
ARTHUR W. ALLEN

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

April, 1912, No. 5, Part I

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part II. SIRE EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE
Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
- Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
- Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES
Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR
By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
- Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR
London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
- Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION
By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
- Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
- Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
- Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

Without Serial Number

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD

THE WASTE OF MILITARISM

From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living

THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29a Beacon Street - - - - - Boston, Mass.

THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS

BY ARTHUR W. ALLEN

The following tables, showing the present annual cost of modern armaments, its increase during the past thirty years, and the increase in national indebtedness on the continent of Europe during the same period, are based on the financial reports of the States of the world as given in the *Almanach de Gotha* and the *Statesman's Year Book* for the years 1881, 1891, 1901, 1911-12,* verified by other authorities when necessary. They represent military and naval outlay in time of peace only: expenditures for actual war are not considered.

In the tables showing the increase in annual outlay for armaments, those nations only are cited which had a military establishment thirty years ago and have since materially enlarged it. Of these, only five are used in the tables showing increase of debt and annual interest charges, the United States and Great Britain being omitted because in time of peace each has steadily diminished its indebtedness, the interest-bearing debt of the United States now being about \$915,000,000 in contrast with \$1,725,000,000 in 1881. Japan was not a military power in 1881.

The figures have their own eloquence for the man who pays. They will perhaps appeal more strongly to the five great military nations of Europe, whose indebtedness is steadily growing, than to us, whose resources are less heavily taxed. Yet when we consider that in the past thirty years we have spent something like \$4,000,000,000 for military purposes (see Table VIII.), exclusive of pensions, and that a saving of less than one-third of that amount would, if applied to the payment of the national interest-bearing debt, have more than extinguished it as

* *Statesman's Year Book*, 1911; *Almanach de Gotha*, 1912.

it stands to-day, it is clear that even we have reason to deplore so large an outlay.

The figures may be depended upon as faithful to the authorities consulted. Where calculations and inferences have been made, the method is explained, so that the reader may judge for himself whether the results and conclusions are correct. There has been no effort to force the figures to fit a preconceived idea. So far as known, no compilation so complete or compact from this standpoint has heretofore been presented, and it is hoped that it will serve as a convenient reference table for those having occasion to employ military and naval expenditure as a basis of argument. For those who have not the time to analyze the tables, the following summary and analysis is given:—

Including the native army of British India, but excluding all other colonial forces and militia, the civilized world now spends in one year for armies and navies (Table I.) about	\$2,250,000,000
Of this amount Great Britain and the Continent spend (Table I.) nearly	\$1,700,000,000
The United States spends (Table I.)	\$283,000,000

The ten chief military nations are Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia, Spain, Turkey, and the United States:

These ten nations spend in one year (Table II.) over	\$1,900,000,000
The number of men composing the armies of these nations on a peace basis is (Table III.) about . .	4,200,000
The present average cost per man per year, as nearly as can be reckoned, is (Table III.) about	\$295
The average cost per man in the United States army—of, say, 85,000—is (Table III.) about	\$1,900
The present average cost per year of the combined armies and navies of these ten nations per unit of population is (Table IV.) about	\$3.33

That of the United States is (Table IV.) about . . .	\$3.07
The same nations now spend in one year for armies and navies, as compared with their total expenditures, an average of (Table V.)	29%
The United States spends (pensions not considered) (Table V.)	43%

The increase in annual military and naval expenditures within the past thirty years is startling.

Omitting Japan, Spain, and Turkey from the list of nations before given, the remaining seven nations thirty years ago spent in one year for their armies and navies about	\$656,000,000
Their present annual expenditure is about	\$1,742,000,000
Excess of one year's expenditure now over one year's expenditure thirty years ago (Table VIII.) . . .	\$1,086,000,000
Percentage of increase, about	165%

Had their annual expenditures remained stationary, the total for the entire period would have been (30 years at \$656,000,000) . . .	\$19,680,000,000
Their actual expenditures are estimated to have been (Table VIII.)	\$32,200,000,000
Indicating a total increase in thirty years of . . .	\$12,520,000,000

Considering only the five principal military nations of Europe,—Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia,—we have the following portentous showing of steadily increasing military expenditures, debt, and interest charges:

In thirty years these five nations have increased their annual expenditures for armies and navies from	\$478,000,000
to	\$1,117,000,000
Excess of one year's expenditures now over one year's expenditures thirty years ago (Table VIII.),	\$639,000,000
Percentage of increase about	134%

Had their annual expenditures remained stationary during that time, the total would have been (30 years at \$478,000,000) about .	\$14,340,000,000
Their actual expenditures are estimated to have been (Table VIII.)	\$21,841,000,000
Indicating a total increase in thirty years of	\$7,501,000,000
Their combined indebtedness thirty years ago was about	\$8,596,000,000
The present combined debt is about	\$18,244,000,000
An increase (Table IX.) of	\$9,648,000,000

A comparison of these last two amounts shows that, on the average, these five nations have borrowed the entire amount of their increased expenditure and some two billions of dollars additional. Whatever the nominal reason for the loans, it is manifest that, had there been no increased expenditure for armament, most of the increase in loans could have been avoided; and it is equally clear that those nations whose debts have not increased with their military expenditures could have reduced their indebtedness, had their expenditures remained stationary.

The total annual interest charge of the same five nations thirty years ago was about	\$341,566,000
The present charge is about	\$651,667,000
Excess, last year over first (Table X.)	\$310,101,000

Had the annual interest charge remained stationary, the total interest payment for the entire period would have been (30 years at \$341,566,000) about	\$10,247,000,000
The actual total interest payment is estimated to have been (Table X.)	\$16,847,000,000
Indicating an increase of	\$6,600,000,000

Combining, we have as the estimated total outlay of five nations in thirty years:

Cost of army and navy (Table VIII.) \$21,841,000,000

Increase of interest charge as a result of increased debt (Table XI.) \$6,600,000,000

Making a total estimated charge due to military preparation during the past thirty years of . . \$28,441,000,000

Has any one been able to show, can any one show, what purpose this steadily increasing outlay has served or promises to serve? Why should the present annual armament bill of the seven nations grouped in Table VIII. be 165 per cent. greater than it was thirty years ago?

At the root of all military preparation lies the desire, somewhere, to attack: defensive preparation follows as a matter of course. This we can at least understand; but it is discreditable alike to morals and to common sense that in this age the most enlightened nations should consume their substance in preparation for a possible war which every nation fears,—a preparation defended mainly on the ground that it is an insurance against war. If the cost were not so preposterous and the insurance really insured, this argument would have force; but the history of the past fifty years demonstrates that armament, however great, does not prevent war when the provocation or the excuse is sufficient. It only makes it more costly and destructive. Prussia and Austria, by the standard of the period, were both fully armed in 1866, and the same was true of Germany and France in 1870, of Russia and Turkey in 1877, and of Japan and Russia in 1904. Armaments are designed for fighting, and sooner or later find employment. Peace under arms is only an extended armistice.

Attention has been called to the fact that military expenses bear a very small ratio to total wealth, and that the percentage in the case of the United States—on a valuation of \$130,000,000,000—is only about one-fifth of one per cent. for the army and navy combined. The first purpose of armament is to protect and preserve nationality, but were its function to conserve property, as the insurance idea implies, it still does not insure the total wealth of a country as a fire insurance policy covers a house, for under no conceivable conditions would an enemy be able to destroy that wealth if he wished to. Financially speaking, armament insures only against the actual cost and loss of war, and, if we consider the four billions* we have paid within the past thirty years, to say nothing of the eight billions and more which, without increasing our present annual expenditure, we bid fair under the existing system to pay out during the next thirty years, we may well question if it might not be cheaper, as a mere financial proposition, to take our chances.

But comparison of expenditure to total wealth is not the crucial test on any theory. Expenditure, of whatever character, is properly comparable not to wealth, but to income. Many a holder of unproductive property has been com-

* We quote the following from the New York *Herald* as an aid to the imagination in attempting to conceive what a "billion" means:—

"Where is the human brain that can adequately grasp the vastness of a billion? How many financiers, in speaking casually of a billion-dollar corporation, realize that they are naming a set of figures that, when carefully considered, appalls by its very vastness?

"How many of them know that since the birth of Christ there have but a few more than a billion minutes passed into history? A minute is such a trifling space of time, and a dollar is such a small sum, yet since the beginning of the Christian era there have been but a few more than a billion minutes, and the silver dollars would plate the sides of every warship in the United States Navy.

"At an ordinary valuation of agricultural lands in the best farming sections of the country, a billionaire could buy a farm as large as the combined area of the States of New York, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. If he could buy land at \$1 an acre, he could purchase all the territory of the United States east of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico.

"On the entire surface of the earth there are but a comparatively few more than 1,500,000,000 human beings, yet science tells us that for untold ages they have been increasing with steady regularity."

pelled to yield it to the tax-gatherer. And, though we in the United States now carry our load easily as compared with the great military nations of Europe burdened with taxation and with growing debts, it is well for us to ask what it would mean if our military and naval expenditures bore the same relation to national wealth as those of some of the nations of Europe. Russia now spends nearly four times as much proportionately as we do; and this rate applied to our army and navy would put our annual armament bill well over a billion of dollars, while compared with Austria we should spend more than four hundred and fifty millions.* It requires little imagination to realize what an outcry would go up, were we spending relatively as much as either of these powers, notwithstanding the fact that the "insurance rate" would not be high, as underwriting rates go. Yet, with the present tendency, we may before many years easily reach the five hundred million mark. If these tables furnish useful arguments for those who are so strongly working to check this tendency and substitute international reason for the present wasteful policies, they will serve their purpose.

* Wealth of United States, \$130,000,000,000; Russia, \$40,000,000,000; Austria-Hungary, \$25,000,000,000. (World Almanac, 1912.)

THE WORLD'S ANNUAL ARMAMENT BILL.

TABLE I.

Country.	Fiscal Year.	Expended for Army.	Expended for Navy.	Total Military Charge.
GREAT BRITAIN AND THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE:				
Austria-Hungary . .	1911	\$73,513,000	\$13,731,000	\$87,244,000
Belgium	1911	11,987,000	—	11,987,000
Bulgaria	1911	7,928,000	—	7,928,000
Denmark	1911-12	6,053,000	3,044,000	9,097,000
France	1911	*187,632,000	83,286,000	270,918,000
Germany	1911-12	203,938,000	114,508,000	318,446,000
Great Britain . . .	1910-11	138,800,000	203,020,000	341,820,000
Greece	1911	4,262,000	1,703,000	5,965,000
Italy	1911-12	†81,033,000	39,643,000	120,676,000
Montenegro	1911	38,000	—	38,000
Netherlands	1912	12,120,000	8,146,000	20,266,000
Norway	1910-11	3,798,000	1,460,000	5,258,000
Portugal	1910-11	8,592,000	3,997,000	12,589,000
Rumania	1911-12	13,856,000	—	13,856,000
Russia	1911	265,642,000	54,128,000	319,770,000
Servia	1911	5,402,000	—	5,402,000
Spain	1911	37,671,000	13,696,000	51,367,000
Sweden	1912	15,314,000	7,251,000	22,565,000
Switzerland	1911	8,785,000	—	8,785,000
Turkey	1911-12	42,071,000	6,223,000	48,294,000
Total (Great Britain and the Continent) . .	—	\$1,128,435,000	\$553,836,000	\$1,682,271,000
UNITED STATES . . .	1910-11	\$162,357,000	\$120,729,000	\$283,086,000
JAPAN	1911-12	49,196,000	43,405,000	92,601,000
BRITISH INDIA . . .	1910-11	100,099,000	—	100,099,000
MEXICO AND SOUTH AMERICA:				
Argentina	1911	\$10,583,000	\$8,236,000	\$18,819,000
Brazil	1911	24,520,000	20,431,000	44,951,000
Chile	1910	9,852,000	7,653,000	17,505,000
Colombia	1911	} Army and Navy not differentiated.	}	1,900,000
Ecuador	1909			1,500,000
Mexico	1911-12			10,700,000
Peru	1910			5,400,000
Uruguay	1910			3,000,000
Venezuela	1910-11			1,500,000
Total (Mexico and South America) . .	—	—	—	\$105,275,000
WORLD TOTAL				\$2,263,332,000

* Including gendarmes.

† Including carabinieri.

MILITARY BUDGETS OF TEN NATIONS ANALYZED.

TABLES II., III., IV., AND V.

TABLE II.

Cost of Armies and Navies.

Country.	Fiscal Year.	Expended for Army.	Expended for Navy.	Total Military Charge.
Austria-Hungary	1911	\$73,513,000	\$13,731,000	\$87,244,000
France	1911	187,632,000	83,286,000	270,918,000
Germany	1911-12	203,938,000	114,508,000	318,446,000
Great Britain	1910-11	138,800,000	203,020,000	341,820,000
Italy	1911-12	81,033,000	39,643,000	120,676,000
Japan	1911-12	49,196,000	43,405,000	92,601,000
Russia	1911	265,642,000	54,128,000	319,770,000
Spain	1911	37,671,000	13,696,000	51,367,000
Turkey	1911-12	42,071,000	6,223,000	48,294,000
United States	1910-11	162,357,000	120,729,000	283,086,000
Totals	—	\$1,241,853,000	\$692,369,000	\$1,934,222,000

TABLE III.

Cost of Armies per Unit of Fighting Force.

Country.	Fighting Force.	Cost of Army.	Cost per Man.
Austria-Hungary	396,000	\$73,513,000	\$186
France	582,000	187,632,000	322
Germany	626,000	203,938,000	326
Great Britain	*262,000	*138,800,000	*530
Italy	291,000	81,033,000	279
Japan	†225,000	49,196,000	†219
Russia	1,250,000	265,642,000	212
Spain	115,000	37,671,000	328
Turkey	†375,000	†42,071,000	†112
United States	85,000	162,357,000	1,910
Totals	4,207,000	\$1,241,853,000	\$295

* Regular army only. Deducting about \$19,600,000 appropriated for reserves and territorials, the average per man of the regular force is about \$455.00.

† Uncertain.

MILITARY BUDGETS OF TEN NATIONS

(CONTINUED)

TABLE IV.

Cost of Armies and Navies per Unit of Population.

Country.	* Population.	Cost of Army and Navy.	Cost per Unit of Population.
Austria-Hungary . .	51,000,000	\$87,000,000	\$1.70
France	39,000,000	271,000,000	7.00
Germany	65,000,000	318,000,000	4.90
Great Britain . . .	45,000,000	342,000,000	7.60
Italy	35,000,000	121,000,000	3.45
Japan	52,000,000	93,000,000	1.79
Russia	160,000,000	320,000,000	2.00
Spain	20,000,000	51,000,000	2.55
Turkey	22,000,000	48,000,000	2.18
United States . . .	92,000,000	283,000,000	3.07
Totals	581,000,000	\$1,934,000,000	\$3.33

* World Almanac, 1912.

TABLE V.

Proportion of Total Military Charges to Total Expenditures.

Country.	Total Expenditures.	Cost of Army and Navy.	%
Austria-Hungary .	*\$890,656,000	\$87,244,000	09.8
France	877,292,000	270,918,000	30.9
Germany	731,236,000	318,446,000	43.5
Great Britain . .	997,410,000	341,820,000	34.3
Italy	500,595,000	120,676,000	24.1
Japan	284,452,000	92,601,000	32.5
Russia	1,360,054,000	319,770,000	23.5
Spain	224,526,000	51,367,000	22.9
Turkey	154,033,000	48,294,000	31.4
United States . . .	654,138,000	283,086,000	43.3
Totals	\$6,674,442,000	\$1,934,222,000	29.0

* This is probably larger than it should be. It is difficult to separate the imperial expenses from those chargeable to the two separate nations.

GROWTH OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES OF SEVEN NATIONS, 1881-1911.

TABLES VI., VII., AND VIII.

The estimated total for thirty years is obtained in all cases: (1) by averaging the amounts at the beginning and end of each decade; (2) by averaging the three amounts thus obtained; (3) by multiplying the final average by thirty.

TABLE VI.
Increase for Armies.

*Country.	1881.	1891.	1901.	1911.	Excess 1911 over 1881.	Estimated Total for Thirty Years.
Austria-Hungary .	\$61,827,000	\$58,645,000	\$59,726,000	\$73,513,000	\$11,686,000	\$1,860,410,000
France	113,597,000	141,694,000	138,723,000	187,632,000	74,035,000	4,310,315,000
Germany	91,075,000	120,964,000	167,588,000	203,938,000	112,863,000	4,360,585,000
Great Britain . .	75,126,000	88,640,000	1307,500,000	138,800,000	63,674,000	3,031,030,000
Italy	40,585,000	56,484,000	54,232,000	81,033,000	40,448,000	1,715,250,000
Russia	90,783,000	123,326,000	162,012,000	265,642,000	174,859,000	4,635,505,000
United States . .	38,117,000	44,583,000	134,775,000	162,357,000	124,240,000	2,295,950,000
Totals	\$511,110,000	\$634,336,000	\$1,024,556,000	\$1,112,915,000	\$601,805,000	\$22,209,045,000
†Excluding the United States and Great Brit- ain	\$397,867,000	\$501,113,000	\$582,281,000	\$811,758,000	\$413,891,000	\$16,882,065,000

* These are the only nations that present a fair basis of comparison since 1881.

† Reckoned as \$107,600,000, in estimating total for thirty years, to allow for extraordinary expenditures in Boer War.

‡ Leaving the five nations named in Tables IX., X., and XI.

GROWTH OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES

(CONTINUED)

TABLE VII.

Increase for Navies.

Country.	1881.	1891.	1901.	1911.	Excess 1911 over 1881.	Estimated Total for Thirty Years.
Austria-Hungary . .	\$4,355,000	\$5,672,000	\$3,698,000	\$13,731,000	\$9,376,000	\$234,130,000
France	42,557,000	43,754,000	65,857,000	83,286,000	40,729,000	1,725,325,000
Germany	11,434,000	23,470,000	38,195,000	114,508,000	103,074,000	1,246,360,000
Great Britain . . .	51,130,000	68,935,000	137,615,000	203,020,000	151,890,000	3,336,250,000
Italy	8,870,000	24,293,000	24,477,000	39,643,000	30,773,000	730,265,000
Russia	13,098,000	21,380,000	46,799,000	54,128,000	41,030,000	1,022,920,000
United States . . .	13,537,000	22,006,000	55,953,000	120,729,000	107,192,000	1,450,920,000
Totals	\$144,981,000	\$210,010,000	\$377,594,000	\$629,045,000	\$484,064,000	\$9,746,170,000
Excluding the United States and Great Britain	\$30,314,000	\$119,069,000	\$184,026,000	\$305,296,000	\$224,982,000	\$4,959,000,000

GROWTH OF MILITARY EXPENDITURES

(CONTINUED)

TABLE VIII.

Increase for Armies and Navies Combined.

Country.	1881.	1891.	1901.	1911.	Excess 1911 over 1881.	Estimated Totals for Thirty Years.
Austria-Hungary,	\$66,182,000	\$64,317,000	\$68,424,000	\$87,244,000	\$21,062,000	\$2,094,540,000
France	156,154,000	185,448,000	204,580,000	270,918,000	114,764,000	6,035,640,000
Germany	102,509,000	144,434,000	205,783,000	318,446,000	215,937,000	5,606,945,000
Great Britain . .	126,256,000	157,575,000	445,115,000	341,820,000	215,564,000	6,367,280,000
Italy	49,455,000	80,777,000	78,709,000	120,676,000	71,221,000	2,445,515,000
Russia	103,881,000	145,206,000	208,811,000	319,770,000	215,889,000	5,658,425,000
United States . .	51,654,000	66,589,000	190,728,000	283,086,000	231,432,000	3,996,870,000
Totals	\$656,091,000	\$844,346,000	\$1,402,150,000	\$1,741,960,000	\$1,085,869,000	\$32,205,215,000
Excluding the United States and Great Brit- ain	\$478,181,000	\$620,182,000	\$766,307,000	\$1,117,054,000	\$638,873,000	\$21,841,065,000

GROWTH OF DEBT AND INTEREST, FIVE MILITARY NATIONS OF EUROPE,
1881-1911.

TABLES IX. AND X.

TABLE IX.

Increase of Debt.*

Country.	1881.	1891.	1901.	1911.	Excess 1911 over 1881.
† Austria-Hungary	\$1,607,800,000	\$2,914,876,000	\$3,219,830,000	\$3,612,389,000	\$2,004,589,000
France	3,972,407,000	6,400,000,000	6,011,079,000	6,286,435,000	2,314,028,000
† Germany	43,804,000	308,377,000	555,738,000	1,224,158,000	1,180,354,000
Italy	1,746,921,000	2,248,200,000	2,451,000,000	2,614,183,000	867,262,000
Russia	1,225,000,000	1,797,365,000	3,112,000,000	4,507,071,000	3,282,071,000
Totals	\$8,595,932,000	\$13,668,818,000	\$15,349,647,000	\$18,244,236,000	\$9,648,304,000

* Interest-bearing debt only. Issues of paper money not included.

† Austrian Empire, Austria proper, and Hungary proper, combined. Since 1867 no loans have been contracted by the Empire.

‡ German Empire only. Prussia alone has a separate debt of nearly \$2,400,000,000.

TABLE X.
Increase of Interest Charge.

Country.	1881.	1891.	1901.	1911.	Excess 1911 over 1881.	Estimated Total for Thirty Years.
Austria-Hungary .	\$65,108,000	\$116,595,000	\$128,793,000	*\$144,496,000	\$79,388,000	\$3,501,900,000
France	149,681,000	256,000,000	249,073,000	192,762,000	43,081,000	6,762,945,000
Germany	1,752,000	12,335,000	18,525,000	41,981,000	40,229,000	527,265,000
Italy	69,900,000	89,818,000	96,000,000	92,145,000	22,245,000	2,668,405,000
Russia	55,125,000	80,881,000	140,065,000	*180,283,000	125,158,000	3,386,500,000
Totals	\$341,566,000	\$555,629,000	\$632,456,000	\$651,667,000	\$310,101,000	\$16,847,015,000

* Estimated at 4%.

THIRTY YEARS COST OF ARMED PEACE.

TABLE XI.

Summary of Tables VI.-X., showing the Combined Cost of Armies and Navies, and Increase of Interest Charges of the Five Great Military Nations of Europe during Thirty Years.

Country.	Armies and Navies.	Increase of Interest Charges Due to Increased Debt.	Total.
Austria-Hungary .	\$2,094,540,000	\$1,548,660,000	\$3,643,200,000
France	6,035,640,000	2,272,515,000	8,308,155,000
Germany	5,606,945,000	474,705,000	6,081,650,000
Italy	2,445,515,000	571,405,000	3,016,920,000
Russia	5,658,425,000	1,732,750,000	7,391,175,000
Totals	\$21,841,065,000	\$6,600,035,000	\$28,441,100,000

OUR OWN MILITARY BURDEN

TABLE XII.

The Army, Navy, and Pension Bill of the United States for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1911.

Expended for	Amount.	Percentage of Total Expenditures
Army	\$162,357,101	24.8
Navy	120,728,786	18.5
Army and Navy	\$283,085,887	43.3
Past war (pensions)	157,980,575	24.1
Total War Expenditures	\$441,066,462	* 67.4
All civil purposes	213,071,536	32.6
	\$654,137,998	100.0

* Showing that more than two-thirds of the present total annual expenditure of the Government of the United States is for expenses incurred in past wars and in preparation for problematical future wars, leaving less than one-third for all civil constructive purposes.

INTEREST-BEARING DEBTS OF THE SOVEREIGN
NATIONS.

TABLE XIII.

Country.	Date.	National Debt.	Approximate Annual Interest Charge.
GREAT BRITAIN AND THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE:			
* Austria-Hungary . . .	Jan. 1, 1911	\$3,612,389,000	\$144,496,000
Belgium	Jan. 1, 1911	740,681,000	21,249,000
Bulgaria	Jan. 1, 1911	122,040,000	5,992,000
Denmark	Apr. 1, 1911	90,682,000	2,545,000
France	Jan. 1, 1910	6,286,435,000	192,762,000
† Germany	Jan. 1, 1911	1,224,158,000	41,981,000
Great Britain	Apr. 1, 1911	3,389,577,000	101,060,000
Greece	Jan. 1, 1911	155,823,000	6,233,000
Italy	July 1, 1909	2,614,183,000	92,145,000
Netherlands	Jan. 1, 1912	465,295,000	12,886,000
Norway	July 1, 1910	86,386,000	3,024,000
Portugal	Jan. 1, 1911	818,578,000	28,650,000
Rumania	Apr. 1, 1910	315,966,000	12,639,000
Russia	Jan. 1, 1911	4,507,071,000	180,283,000
Servia	Jan. 1, 1911	135,886,000	6,115,000
Spain	Jan. 1, 1911	1,886,221,000	75,448,000
Sweden	Jan. 1, 1911	145,105,000	5,079,000
Switzerland	Jan. 1, 1910	24,360,000	853,000
‡ Turkey	Sept. 13, 1911	508,981,000	20,359,000
Total, Great Britain and the Continent	—	\$27,129,817,000	\$953,799,000
UNITED STATES	July 1, 1911	\$915,353,000	\$21,311,000
JAPAN	Apr. 1, 1911	1,325,198,000	59,312,000
MEXICO AND SOUTH AMERICA:			
Argentina	Jan. 1, 1911	\$531,858,000	\$26,593,000
Brazil	Jan 1, 1911	654,303,000	32,715,000
Chile	Jan. 1, 1911	175,000,000	8,750,000
Colombia	Jan. 1, 1911	16,622,000	831,000
Ecuador	July 1, 1910	22,000,000	1,100,000
Mexico	July 1, 1911	219,537,000	10,977,000
Peru	1909	8,400,000	462,000
Uruguay	Jan. 1, 1911	134,229,000	6,711,000
Venezuela	Jan. 1, 1911	39,300,000	1,179,000
Total, Mexico and South America	—	\$1,801,249,000	\$89,318,000
World Total	—	\$31,171,617,000	\$1,123,740,000

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

-
- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOY. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN

BY
JOHN H. DEFOREST

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

APRIL, 1912, No. 5, PART II

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES
AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFER-
ENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE
Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
- Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
- Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED
STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES
Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR
By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
- Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR
London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND
Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
- Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
- Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
- Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE
CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
- Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE
FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
- Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
- Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS

Without Serial Number

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL
FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD

THE WASTE OF MILITARISM

From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living

THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN.

BY DR. JOHN H. DEFORST

The annual consideration of the naval appropriations by Congress is almost invariably accompanied by some big or little war-scare, punctually provided for the purpose of creating the atmosphere favorable for the requisite lavishness by the adepts in the manufacture of the requisite sentiment. The clear logic of the situation prescribes of course the steady decrease of the machinery for the settlement of international disputes by fighting, corresponding to the steady and now so great increase of the machinery for their settlement by arbitration and the international tribunals; yet we see the strange and mournful paradox of a constant demand by a certain set of men for increase where manifestly, unless governments are to be accounted insincere, there should be constant and large decrease. There is no "scare" which is worked harder or more regularly than the Japanese scare; and there is none which, on the whole, has been so easy and so influential, although there is really none which is so silly or so culpable. The exposure of one of these ignorant (if the word may be charitably used), shameful, and representative attacks upon Japan was so searching and decisive as to be historic; and, as it suffices for the whole family of scares of this sort, it should never be forgotten when the annual scare comes round on the eve of the appropriations debate. It was in 1908, by Dr. John H. DeForest, the eminent American scholar and missionary to Japan, whose almost whole lifetime of service

there had given him an understanding of American and Japanese relations completer than that possessed by almost any other living man, and whose subsequent death has been a distinct international loss. It is to be hoped that readers of this pamphlet may consult other of the valuable writings of Dr. DeForest in this field, like his paper on "American Ignorance of Oriental Languages," published by the Association for International Conciliation. The paper here reprinted is a letter written by Dr. DeForest for the Hartford (Conn.) *Courant*.

Some time in January, 1908, Captain R. P. Hobson delivered in Hartford one of the addresses by which for years, all over the country, he has been endeavoring to stir up the suspicion and animosity of our people against Japan, by allegations that thousands of the Japanese are working night and day to turn out arms and prepare otherwise for swooping down upon the United States or its possessions in the Pacific. The Japanese are taught by their government, he said, to hate Americans, and they are only waiting an opportunity to declare war. This wild alarm he and others like him are constantly sounding by way of urging the nation into the support of their insane navy programme. It chanced that in his audience at Hartford was Dr. DeForest, who had spent thirty-three years in Japan, and knew definitely how false and wicked was Captain Hobson's talk. He at once addressed an open letter to Captain Hobson, which was published in the Hartford *Courant* of January 13. The *Courant* said editorially in printing it: "We had not supposed that thoughtful people anywhere took Hobson seriously. But it seems they do, here and there. This letter is written by one who knows, and therefore holds an advantage over the youthful swashbuckler who breathes destruction to Japan at such a safe distance. The letter is as con-

vincing as it ought to be unnecessary." Dr. DeForest's letter follows:—

Happening to be in Hartford a few days ago, I went to hear your address under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association on "America's Mighty Mission." While some of your minor statements were correct enough, I find myself so wholly dissenting from your main propositions that I wish to avail myself of the freedom of the press, in order that as many as possible of those who heard you, or have read newspaper reports of your addresses, may have another side of these very serious problems to consider. You said: "Japan has had the war habit for more than eight hundred years. It is with her a question of heredity. It is inevitable that, as the Japanese emerge from wars of their own, they engage in wars with other countries. Japan uses the science and knowledge of the world chiefly for war."

Please let me ask you, Captain Hobson, where did you learn this? Isn't your history a little loose? I should suppose that a Congressman would know that for two hundred and fifty years before Commodore Perry's visit there was no nation on earth that could compare with Japan in the peace habit. While Europe and America were in the midst of long years of bitter wars, revolutions and mutual slaughters, there was for two hundred and fifty years neither internal nor external disturbance of peace in the empire of Japan.

Your sweeping judgment of the national character is that they have the war habit. But do you know what they say of themselves? As you claim the right to say what is the main characteristic of our nation, you surely will allow them to testify concerning themselves. For ages it has been the traditional teaching in Japan that the cherry blossom, which fills valleys and plains with its delicate perfume and then in self-sacrifice gives itself to die, is the symbol by which they have always interpreted themselves. Probably you did not know that, when Perry opened Japan to the knowledge of Western history, one thing that shocked the Japanese was the awfully bloody histories of the nations on this side of the globe. And one of their great moralists, Yokoi Shonan, expressed this wide feeling when he begged his government to send him on a mission to the West, that he might plead with those nations to put an end to the brutal

wars which two hundred and fifty years of peace had made Japan profoundly dislike.

I take it that you neither read nor speak the Japanese language, and so have only second-hand avenues into the literature and history of Japan. So, in your hasty tour through a section of Japan, you could not have noticed that at the entrance of countless towns and villages a high flag-staff stands, at the base of which is written, "Peace be to this Village." Have you ever compared the national hymn of Japan with those of the nations of the West? Her hymn is of very recent date, hardly thirty years old, and you would expect to find something of "the war habit" that has grown "for eight hundred years" in this hymn. For hymns, to be national, must express the deepest and strongest sentiment of the nation. Not a shadow of war here. We of the West have to be careful how we sing our national hymns where representatives of different nations are gathered. But Japan's national hymn is so absolutely without the war spirit that it can be sung anywhere in the world without giving the slightest offence.

In the course of your address your vivid imagination led you to picture the millions of China, too, as virtually possessed with this same war habit, and you painted in fiery colors those five hundred millions of yellow men, "where countless soldiers could shoot as straight as we can, and could live on one-tenth of what we should need," descending on our Pacific coast with irresistible force. Are you not as far afield here as with Japan? I had the honor recently of an interview with the Hon. John W. Foster, who kindly presented me with a copy of his "Present Conditions in China." With his long and honored diplomatic service in the East, whose peoples he knows and whose trusted adviser he has been for decades, he has a right to say in this pamphlet: "For many generations China has been the least warlike of any of the great nations. Her most venerated philosopher and statesman, Confucius, taught her people that nations as well as individuals should settle their differences by appeals to right and justice."

In view of these facts, it seemed to me that you had somehow got the wrong perspective, and that you should have reversed your vision, and told your audience that we Westerners have the war habit badly, and might well learn something from those oldest and most peaceful nations of the East.

I was in Manchuria as a guest of the army for six weeks, and was given in my passport the grade of a colonel. I had letters of introduction from the premier, Count Katsura, to all the generals and Marshal Oyama. The premier is a general of the regular army, and he said to me in all solemnity: "I am a soldier, but I hate war. We tried every possible way to come to a settlement with Russia through peaceful means, and after six months of useless diplomatic correspondence we simply had to fight for our national existence." This is a true expression of the heart of Japan's generals. Mr. Foster is right in his estimate of the peaceful character of the peoples of the East. What he says agrees with the conclusions I have reached, after thirty-three years of residence there.

Let me now refer to the charge you repeatedly made that Japan is trying to bring on war with America at the earliest possible moment, knowing that we are unprepared and that she could win easy victories, provided she can get a pretext for beginning the fight. In making this startling charge, which is not true, and is an insulting and brutal way of attacking a friendly nation, you seem to have utterly ignored the repeated public statements of your superiors. You vividly pictured our President sitting "in sackcloth and ashes," under the browbeating of the oily-worded Viscount Hayashi, minister of foreign affairs in Tokyo. And this poor hectoring President of ours was at the same time telling the world in his message to Congress about the "warm friendship" maintained between Japan and the United States for so many years "without a break." Another of your superiors in office, our Secretary of War, Mr. Taft, unqualifiedly stated in Tokyo only last October that the two governments and the two peoples are perfectly secure in their friendly relations, which no local disturbances can affect. He says, with reference to war talk: "It would be a crime against modern civilization if Japan and America went to war, and it would be at once hateful and insane. The people of both countries are alike repugnant to the idea, and the governments of both countries may be trusted to be faithful in this matter to the people's wishes."

Another of your superiors has a very different version from yours of our diplomatic relations with Japan over the San Francisco school question. You say that Japan virtually gave "an ultimatum" to our government, and that she

insultingly made "demands." Secretary Root said in his address before the American Society of International Law: "The government of Japan made representations to the government of the United States that, inasmuch as the children of residents who were citizens of all other foreign countries were freely admitted to the schools, the subjects of Japan residing in the United States were, by that exclusion, denied the same privileges, liberties and rights which were accorded to the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation." Now, as a member of Congress, you ought to know the difference between a diplomatic representation and an ultimatum or a demand. It is the difference between impending war or peace. An ultimatum is the last diplomatic word before the beginning of active war. Your superior has told the world that there wasn't a shadow of an ultimatum. And he adds, "It is a pleasure to be able to say that never for a moment was there, as between the government of the United States and the government of Japan, the slightest departure from perfect good temper, mutual confidence and kindly consideration."

You will, of course, allow that our ambassadors in Tokyo have at least as good sources for knowing facts as you. Our ambassador, Luke Wright, on his return from Japan last September, said to Americans through the papers: "The talk of war between this country and Japan isn't even respectable nonsense. There is no situation between Japan and the United States other than the very pleasant and friendly relation which has always existed. Japan no more wants a war with us than we want one with her, and the idea that there is an impending conflict between the two countries is ridiculous. Japan regards us as her best friend, and there is a perfect understanding between the two countries." If now, Captain Hobson, you say that things have changed since Mr. Wright's day, and that we now have facts that throw light on the Japanese war habit, let me quote our new ambassador in Tokyo, who asserted before the Oriental Association on December 11 that, "so far as our two countries are concerned, there is not now one serious question that remains unsettled."

These gentlemen whom I have quoted are your superiors in everything that pertains to first-hand information on diplomatic matters, and their statements are unequivocally the opposite of yours. I will quote some others who are

also very superior to you in their knowledge of the people of Japan. I refer to the missionaries who speak the Japanese language, live with the people, have strong friendships among the educated classes, read the papers, and are agreed on this one vital point,—the way the Japanese think about us. They have watched not without anxiety the irresponsible jingo utterances of a section of the American press and their slanders of Japan. They have openly sent their formal message to the people of the United States; and, in view of such utterances as you feel impelled to make, the public should have the saner views of men who have first-class opportunities for knowing what you can get only in less direct ways. Here is their message:—

“While we, as missionaries, have nothing to do with questions of national economics or international politics, yet in matters affecting the mutual good-will of nations we, as messengers of God’s universal Fatherhood and man’s universal Brotherhood, are peculiarly interested; and, as Americans now residing in Japan, we feel bound to do all that is in our power to remove misunderstandings and suspicions which are tending to interrupt the long-standing friendship between this nation and our own. Hence we wish to bear testimony to the sobriety, sense of international justice, and freedom from aggressive designs exhibited by the great majority of the Japanese people and to their faith in the traditional justice and equity of the United States. Moreover, we desire to place on record our profound appreciation of the kind treatment which we experience at the hands of both government and people; our belief that the alleged ‘belligerent attitude’ of the Japanese does not represent the real sentiments of the nation; and our ardent hope that local and spasmodic misunderstandings may not be allowed to affect in the slightest degree the natural and historic friendship of the two neighbors on opposite sides of the Pacific.”

This document is signed by over a hundred men, many of whom have lived in Japan over a quarter of a century. Every one of these men would repudiate without hesitation every one of your assertions to which I have referred.

In thus replying to your public statements, I am not ignorant that the immigration question is a perplexing and

also irritating one; and I happen to know that, because it is irritating, both governments have kept pen from paper. Of course, I am not in the secrets of the government, but, as far as I understand things, I believe there has been no diplomatic correspondence whatever between the two governments until the very recent note of Secretary Root to Viscount Aoki concerning the immigration question and the Japanese government's reply through our Ambassador O'Brien. Heretofore it has been simply diplomatic conversations. But meantime and repeatedly both governments, through their most responsible agents, have unwaveringly said to the world, in the straightest possible use of words, that there is no break in the friendly relations between the two governments. Just a year ago I was in our ambassador's box at the opening of the Japanese Diet, and heard Premier Saionji say: "I have been questioned with reference to the San Francisco affair and asked what our government is going to do about it. To this I reply that the matter has not reached the diplomatic stage. It is merely a local affair within the jurisdiction of a friendly country, and we trust the government of the United States to do the just thing." A few weeks ago I was accorded an interview with Japan's ambassador, Viscount Aoki. His words to me were: "War with America is impossible. If immigration tends to make an unfavorable economic situation here or arouses race prejudice, then we will stop our laborers from coming to this country. The good-will and friendship of the great republic is not to be imperilled for the sake of a few immigrants." Undoubtedly Japan feels hurt over the determination to exclude her laborers, while those of other nations are freely allowed to come. It is like a blow from a friend,—from one she has always called with profound respect her "teacher." But again and again, during the last year's misunderstandings, Japan's great statesmen and warriors and her great newspapers have said, with deep regard and gratitude for what America has done for her, "We can never fight the United States." You may be sure she will never raise a finger against us unless we become so unrighteous as openly to insult her, throw away her valuable friendship, and aggressively arouse her war feelings.

I am impelled to say to you, Captain Hobson, that your medicine of repression, first towards Europe and then towards Japan, seemed to me a reversion to barbarism. Your

address seems to me wholly unworthy of a Christian gentleman and an elected representative of our Republic. You said with violent gestures that the Japanese attitude towards us is "awful and wicked." You, who evidently know nothing of their press, call it "bitter." For the sake of my country's fair name, I want to say publicly that your sweeping and baseless misstatements show colossal ignorance of the character of the Japanese. If our people were not too sensible to take you seriously, if you could carry the majority of our people with you, your words would surely imperil the peace of the world, the large part of which you cruelly insulted. As a citizen of the United States, I protest against your "awful and wicked" and "bitter" accusations of a great and friendly nation.

For the sake of Japan, whose people I respect and love, and whose spirit I believe will bring generous help to the world in the peaceful solution of the greatest of all the twentieth-century problems, the coming together of the East and the West, I openly affirm that your statements about the war habit of the Japanese, and their war designs on our Republic, have no better foundation than that furnished by your ignorance of history and of diplomatic usages between governments. And for the sake of the religion which I believe is the greatest force that will bind the race of man, North, South, East, West, in one abiding brotherhood, I must protest against your using Christian plat-forms and quoting Christian Scripture while poisoning the minds of your hearers against a people whose friendship the millions of this land prize.

The true feelings of the people of this country towards Japan are, I firmly believe, expressed in the resolution passed by a thousand representatives of our Congregational churches at Cleveland last October and that at the recent Young Men's Christian Association Convention in Washington. Said the former: "We desire to assure Japan that the heart of Christian America beats true to the unbroken friendship between the United States and Japan for over half a century." Said the latter: "This Convention sends special greetings from the North American Associations to the associations of our brotherhood in Japan and China, with strong reaffirmations of the warm friendship existing between the nations of the North American Continent and those two great empires of Asia."

The interest stirred up in Hartford by Dr. DeForest's vigorous protest was so profound that a great meeting was held in one of the largest churches in the city to listen to an address by him on the subject of our relations with Japan. The mayor presided, with clergymen representing seven different churches seated about him on the platform. Dr. DeForest recounted the reasons why Japan was and would continue to be friendly with America and why we should hold the same feeling towards Japan, condemning in no uncertain words those papers and individuals who were striving to break the friendship between the two nations. One cause for the friendship between the two nations was the fact that this country had sent to Japan a long line of scholarly and sympathetic representatives. Many Japanese students have come to this country and entered our schools, been taken into our homes, and gone back to their native land to hold many of the important positions in the empire. At the close of Dr. DeForest's address the following resolutions, read by President MacKenzie, of the Hartford Theological School, were adopted by a unanimous rising vote:—

“That we hereby express to the Emperor and people of Japan our profound respect for their courage, their enlightenment, and their progress. We are grateful for their appreciation of us as a people, and rejoice that they trust our friendship. We in turn wish to declare our confidence in their abiding loyalty to the unwritten alliance which has bound the two nations together for half a century and to reciprocate Japan's expressions desirous of abiding peace.

“That we earnestly protest in the strongest terms against the wide-spread and systematic efforts that have been made by some journals and individuals to foment distrust and enmity between two friendly nations, and brand as malicious and unwarrantable all the statements which have tended to throw suspicion upon the integrity of the governments of both our own nation and Japan.”

This vigorous and righteous action of the Hartford churches should be emulated and followed in a thousand places all over the country. It impeaches the intelligence and the seriousness of our American churches and Young Men's Christian Associations that so many of them have been found willing to give the use of their pulpits and platforms to an arrant mischief-maker, enabling him under respectable auspices to repeat widely his ignorant and incendiary harangues at critical times, when soberness, conciliation, and truth are peculiarly imperative. If there are any institutions of which we have a right to expect and to demand that they should be agencies, not for stirring up suspicion, enmity and strife, but for promoting good understanding and good-will in the family of nations, surely we have a right to ask and expect this from our churches and religious organizations.

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES.

President David Starr Jordan of Stanford University returned in October, 1911, from an extended visit to Japan in the interest of international fraternity and progress, under the auspices of the World Peace Foundation. He visited every important center, gave addresses almost every day, and was in touch and often in close conference with the leading statesmen and scholars of Japan. No recent American visitor has had better opportunity to measure the best Japanese public opinion; and the following passage from an interview published in the Japanese papers as he came away will be read with much interest in this country:

"In coming to Japan, I wished primarily to assure myself as to the present attitude of the people toward the suppression of war among civilized nations. This is the most important moral, political or financial movement of our time, and I was sure that the people of Japan could not be indifferent to it. The suppression of war and of war debts must come in time as a matter of righteousness and justice. The strongest immediate force is that of finance, as war is the greatest foe of legitimate business.

"No nation was ever able to maintain at the same time a great army, a great navy, a vigorous foreign policy, a great debt and the prosperity of the people. Two of the five may be held for a time, and occasionally

three, never any more. For the waste of war preparation in time of peace, from which the whole world is suffering to-day, there is no sudden remedy. The formation of closer relations among civilized nations, the growth of enlightened public opinion, the decision of business men that there are better uses for money, the growth of better understandings by which we shall recognize that the people of other nations have no evil designs against us,—all these are essentials in the formation of lasting and honorable peace.

"The fact that most nations are controlled in large part by the unseen empire of European financiers makes for peace, no doubt, but it makes also for bankruptcy. War costs one hundred times what it cost fifty years ago, and even the shortest war, ending in victory or in defeat, may mean years of crushing poverty for the 'common people' of both nations concerned.

"I find that all these matters are realized in Japan, as they are coming to be realized all over Europe and America. The currents of world life flow through Japan, and Japan's response to truth and justice is not unlike that of the other great nations.

"In brief, I do not find in Japan any of the spirit of war for war's sake, which has been the bane of European politics, nor any desire, on the part of people wise and well informed, for international aggression of any sort. While one may hear opinions of almost any kind if he looks for them, I find the average public opinion in Japan on the question of friendly relations among nations quite as sane and rational as in any other nation whatever."

At the dinner of welcome given to Mr. Hamilton Holt, managing editor of the *Independent* and one of the directors of the World Peace Foundation, and Mr. Lindsey Russell, president of the New York Japan Society, at the Imperial Hotel, Tokyo, September 25, 1911, Prince Tokugara, President of the Japanese House of Peers, who presided, uttered the following weighty words:—

"*Gentlemen*,—It is my pleasant duty to-night to propose the health of our guests from America, whom we all honor, love and esteem. No Japanese can visit their great country without being overwhelmed with hospitality and all forms of attention and courtesy, and we all feel happy whenever we are given the opportunity to reciprocate, though the resources for entertainment are lamentably inadequate in this country. But to the gentlemen whom we are so proud to have as our guests to-night we owe gratitude not only for their hospitality to us while in their country, but for their noble efforts in the cause of peace and amity between the two great nations. Nobody who really

knows the American people can ever doubt that their sentiments are thoroughly friendly to us. As for ourselves, we all know that we are in no less degree friendly to the Americans. As a matter of fact, the relations between the two nations have always been extremely cordial, and there is every reason to believe that they will always continue friendly. We must not, however, forget that there are people in the United States who make it their business to start now and then an anti-Japanese campaign through the press and on the platform. These people are not necessarily at heart unfriendly to us. Their object, so I am informed by those who ought to know, is not to embroil the two countries in war, but to create a situation which may promote the furtherance of a scheme of military and naval increase. Whatever may be the cause, it is a deplorable fact that the otherwise perfectly placid waters of political relations between the two countries are periodically threatened by a mischievous attempt at disturbance. These despicable attempts ought never to succeed, and I am sure that they will never succeed. But all the same they constitute a danger which all lovers of peace and good-will between the two peoples should not ignore, for there are ignorant people in all countries who may easily be misled. For this reason it is important that there should be men in America, men of influence and power, who will instruct and enlighten their fellow-countrymen as to the real state of affairs and expose the hollowness of the sensational statements which the agitators do not scruple to spread broadcast. There are, happily, no lack of men of this type in America, and among these noble workers for peace and disinterested friends of Japan none are more prominent and none have done more for the cause than our guests of honor to-night."

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

-
- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE

BY
HENRY M. SIMMONS

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

April, 1912, No. 5, Part III

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

NOTE.—A true philosophy of history and politics is of supreme importance for all workers for the peace and better organization of the world. The clear conception of a law of progress in human affairs, an "increasing purpose" running through the ages, is the mightiest reinforcement for the workers for progress. Immense harm has resulted from the fact that our modern doctrine of evolution, intrinsically so solvent and illuminating, came into vogue in connection with the more or less mechanical and unspiritual philosophy which was then prevalent in England and Germany,—a philosophy which did not see beyond the realm of secondary cause. It is questionable whether, by reason of this fact, the net result of the influence of the doctrine in ethics, politics and sociology has not been up to the present time quite as baneful as beneficial. The common conceptions of "the struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest," which for half a century have had such wide currency and influence, have been made the basis and excuse for manifold national as well as individual selfishness and exploitation of weaker peoples by the strong. The doctrine, with the philosophy in whose saddle it rode, did not tend to promote self-sacrifice, co-operation and the ideals of an organic international life. It was only when it became interpreted in the terms of idealism and a clear teleology, as here in America in such books as John Fiske's "Destiny of Man," that it began to render its true service in the political and social field. Immanuel Kant, a century before, in such essays as that upon "The Natural Principle of the Political Order," had really covered thoroughly the same ground; and it was but natural that, with such a philosophy, he should write his famous essay upon "Perpetual Peace," in which he rendered such conspicuous service to the peace movement. It is in the spirit of this philosophy that the impressive paper reprinted by permission in the present pamphlet, a paper so thoroughly informed by the doctrine of evolution, is written. Henry M. Simmons was one of the most thoughtful and gifted men in the American pulpit in the last generation, serving during the later years of his life as minister of the Unitarian church in Minneapolis. The essay here presented was included in his volume entitled "New Tables of Stone," published in 1904, about the time of his death.

A striking illustration of the same philosophy of history is furnished by the chapter upon "The World State," incorporated by Professor Philip Van Ness Myers in the latest editions of his popular text-book of *Medieval and Modern History*; and this is especially commended to the attention of teachers as a significant new phenomenon in school histories, and emphatically a sign of the times. Professor Myers places at the head of this chapter the following word from Bluntschli: "Unconquerable time itself works on unceasingly, bringing the nations nearer to one another, awakening the universal consciousness of the community of mankind; and this is the natural preparation for a common organization of the world." The long processes, collisions and struggles of history, the chapter shows, find their justification and interpretation only as we see that they have all been informed by the increasing purpose and have been preparations for the fraternity and co-operation of peoples and a true world order. See Emerson's essay on "War" and Bushnell's "The Growth of Law."—E. D. M.

“THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE.”

BY REV. HENRY M. SIMMONS.

One of the last papers published by John Fiske is his Phi Beta Kappa address on the ethical aim in Nature. It is entitled “The Cosmic Roots of Love and Self-sacrifice.” It seems, however, to leave these roots quite short of cosmic. It locates them in the prolonged infancy and close motherhood of mammalian life. But, surely, they reach lower than that. The hen is no mammal, and her infants walk the first hour; yet she shows so much “love and self-sacrifice” that even Jesus took her to illustrate his own. Poets back to Euripides have praised the devotion of birds for their young. Nor is it limited to their young, but we read of them dying of grief for mates; and Darwin tells of pelicans and crows, old and blind, but faithfully fed and cared for by their companions. Here seems a foregleam of the benevolence that builds our hospitals for the aged and infirm. Even the parental devotion in every bird’s nest shows the growth of love already begun.

Below birds it has begun, and Romanes says “parental affection” is found among reptiles and fish. Back in the old Jurassic swamps and Devonian seas there was some virtue. Even below vertebrates, in the insect world, there was something like it. Bees sacrifice themselves for their community, dying for their hive as patriots for their country, or attacking another as devotedly as Christian armies sack Chinese towns.

So the ant is praised by even the Bible as an example for men; and not only “sluggards,” but most citizens, might “consider her ways” and be wiser. Professor Everett said, “In the ant-hill there is a civilization very like our own,”

—and in some respects it seems better. An ant community may contain more members than there are men in Louisville; yet Lubbock says they never quarrel, but are all “laboring with the utmost harmony for the common good.” They may have no moral sense, but they do their duty better than many a man who boasts of his. They may have little sympathy; but Lubbock says there are “good Samaritans among them,” helping wounded sisters with something like “humane feelings,” while all show extreme devotion to the larval infants that are not even their own. When we think further of their vast numbers,—more in a square mile than there are men in America,—all and ever busy in work which Spencer calls “almost wholly altruistic,” we see that “the roots of self-sacrifice” not only reach far below mammals, but pervade a vast world of social insects.

Lower still this social and altruistic principle may be traced down the animal scale, to the very sponge, which is a genuine society, made of many individuals united in service of each other and their community. Such societies may have no ethical or even conscious life, but they already proclaim the ethical principle of mutual service for the common good. They show the “roots” we are searching,—only roots, indeed, and with no hint of the rich fruit to come, but already started in life so low that it used to be thought vegetable.

Even in vegetable life they have started. The plant, too, is a sort of society, with varied members united in mutual service and sacrifice. Leaves give their lives for the tree, like good families for the State. The flower is a family, botanists say, with even the wedding of sexes and parental sacrifice for the offspring. The flower may not be conscious of its virtues,—and we often wish that some human families were, in this respect, more like it. But in it the ethical principle is on the way to consciousness.

It is on the way far below the flower. Down among the moulds and microscopic algæ we see two cells of different

sexes, giving themselves to each other and their offspring with something of the same principle and process seen in the bird's nest and the human home. To such unions even so unfanciful a scientist as Haeckel ascribed the origin of love, tracing its source back to what he called "the elective affinity of two differing cells." Even so orthodox a writer as Drummond, using the same term as Mr. Fiske and somewhat before him, spoke of their "self-sacrifice," and said, "Love is not a late arrival," but "its roots began to grow with the first cell that budded on this earth." So do they reach to the lowest foundations of life.

Do they not reach even back of life to the inorganic world? The same principle of union and co-operation is found in everything there. In every rock and crystal of the mountains and drop of the sea, molecules have united in systems; and each molecule in turn is called a marriage of atoms. Not only Haeckel's "affinity of differing cells," but all chemical affinity, is at least prophetic of that which unites us in societies and families.

And is not the earth itself member of a society which is something like a family? Even the most prosaic astronomers call the planets a "sisterhood," which have all sprung from the solar mass as a common mother, and have in turn given birth to a score of satellite daughters. All these worlds form a family; and, though they have separated so far, they are still held together by a sort of family affection, which is none the less real because named gravitation. Under its rule, each daughter world not only bends her onward impulse into a filial orbit around her mother, but turns from her course to greet every passing sister planet. Even the wayward comet sons come back from their wide wanderings to be welcomed and warmed again at the family hearth.

A foolish fancy, of course, but yet a fact! The very gravitation which unites the solar system is another of these mutual attractions which we have been tracing. Nor is it limited to our own, but is seen in many a system of double

or triple stars moving about each other or around their common center. It not only moves worlds, but gathered and globed them to begin with, astronomers say; and in the spiral streaks of many a nebula we seem to see the movement starting, and matter slowly drawing together to shine in new suns and systems.

So does this attraction and union, in one phase or another, pervade the universe,—a cosmic principle. It is ever attended by the opposite one of separation, but is the more creative of the two. It blesses everywhere, from the gathering and warming of worlds in systems up to the gathering of animals in societies and of men in families warm with sympathy and love. In it, rather than in the mere prolongation of infancy, would I see the “cosmic roots of love,”—reaching back of mammals and of all motherhood, back of Haeckel’s cells and oldest suns, running through the wreaths of the nebula, threading every atom, thrilling through the infinite ether, already alive in that mysterious gravitation which, like the spirit of God in the Biblical story, first moved on the face of the abyss, and said, “Let there be light.”

I fancy there may yet come some poet-philosopher who will commence his ethical study, not with Scripture, not even with human souls or lowest cells or solar systems, but, back of them all, with the first movement of matter toward union. He will read in the lines of the gathering nebula a heavenly scripture already revealing the law of love, and in every star a text in prophecy of Christ. He will simply trace this cosmic principle of *union* through its advancing phases in creation.

It is ever opposed by repulsion, separation, strife, but is ever harmonizing the strife. Just as, in gravitation, it gathered diffuse matter into globes, and the separating globes in systems, so on our globe, in the finer chemical affinities, it combined atoms in molecules, and these in compounds ever more complex. In condensation and co-

hesion it brought liquids and solids. In crystallization it built the myriad shapes of beauty in the rocks. In more marvellous vital organization it combined compounds in cells, and these again in the countless forms of life.

Among these individual forms came that cruel competition and strife which pessimists make so much of, and which has indeed given to Nature a tragic aspect. But in melioration of the strife our principle took a *social* form, uniting individuals in societies of mutual help, which pessimists forget. This social principle has everywhere prevailed, not only in the vast insect world, but in animals of all sorts, from buffaloes on the plain to beavers in the pond, bringing swarms, schools, flocks, herds and myriads of minor co-operations, like those told in Kropotkin's book. He holds that, even "as a factor of evolution," the fraternal principle of mutual aid has been much more important than "mutual strife," and has thus largely redeemed Nature from the common charge of cruelty.

Most of these animal societies seem to be merely utilitarian, with little real sympathy. But this comes with the higher union of the *family*. The family begins low, as we saw, and its affection is long feeble. Even conjugal love is at first fleeting. Among some insects the bride does not hesitate to slay her husband when the nuptials are over. Maternal love may be no stronger. Even among vertebrates, eggs and infants are widely left to perish, as they may well be when there are so many of them. When the progeny of a single herring would soon fill the ocean solid, maternal care would hardly be a virtue. But, with higher organization and fewer offspring, that care increases. In birds it becomes proverbial; and the mother, if not loving her neighbor as herself, at least loves her infants as herself, and so seems almost to have begun to be a Christian. Her love is very limited, however, and lasts only a month, after which her moral law is suspended till another season.

But the mammalian structure carries that union further,—

unites mother and infant much more closely and longer. At length, the delicate human body and brain so prolong the helpless infancy that the union has to last for years, and thus becomes a habit to last through life. The family becomes permanent, and its affection fixed. Its permanence also extends the union,—holds together parents and children and children's children in a widening circle of kinsmen. So we reach one of those clans, gens, or little tribes, in which society seems everywhere to have started. This cosmic principle of union, working from atoms upward, has at length unfolded its higher meaning, and brought, not merely a utilitarian society of animals, but a human brotherhood inspired with sympathy.

This little *tribe* often shows that brotherhood perfect between its own members, however cruel to others. Boyle says that even the Dyaks, so famed for ferocity and murders, were yet, among themselves, "humane to a degree that might well shame" us. Some refuse to believe this of savages, especially of heathen. But why? Why think affection impossible among barbarians, when it abounds among birds? Why think self-sacrifice impossible among the heathen, when it is the law of every ant-hill? Why think pagans cannot keep the ten commandments, when the mere moon keeps every one of them, except that of the Sabbath? Kindness comes by nature, and even by necessity, for the tribe cannot hold together without it. It is still confined to the tribe, however, and perhaps is fiercely hostile to outsiders, only the narrow harmony of a hornet's nest.

But our principle works on through history to extend the harmony. It unites little tribes in larger, and these in larger still, until a *nation* is formed. The nation keeps new peace within, and cultivates the juster ideals seen in ancient literature. Plato wrote, "May I, being of sound mind, do to others as I would that they should do to me"; and already the sentiment was familiar from Athens to the end of Asia. This brotherhood, however, was only national. Even

the comparatively humane Greeks did not try to be so to foreigners; and Plato, in giving the Golden Rule, did not mean for a moment that it was to be practised toward barbarians.

But the principle worked on, joining nations in larger union and extending the *humanity*. In the West this extension came through the Roman rule, uniting peoples from the British Isles to the Euphrates, and giving to ethics a cosmopolitan tone. In the century before Christ, Cicero and the Stoics preached universal brotherhood; Varro, in giving the Golden Rule, no longer left it local, but said it should embrace all the nations of mankind. In the time of the apostles the pagan Lucan predicted that the world would soon cast aside its weapons, and all nations learn to love. In practice, too, there was for two centuries, in the "*Pax Romana*," such a world-peace as earth never saw before or since. The Romans, however, were not the people to perfect that union. They had brought it through vast wars, and still kept class divisions and cruel wrongs that made the Stoics' precepts seem a mockery.

But now came from the nation of *Israel* a movement to further that brotherhood, and, still more important, to identify it at last with religion. That nation itself well illustrates this law of ethical growth. It had started, according to the Biblical story, in one of those primitive families, with not even the domestic virtues yet fully established. Jacob robs his twin brother and deceives his dying father, and is incited to this by his mother; and his sons, the fathers of the tribes of Israel, seek to slay their best brother and finally sell him into slavery. These tribes, too, though fairly united within, had fought each other, and had well-nigh exterminated Benjamin. But they had at length united in a nation, reached a larger justice, and learned the Decalogue. The justice, however, had been only national. Even eminent saints in Israel denied the Decalogue in dealing with other peoples. They burned town after town even in the name

of the Lord, and "utterly destroyed all that breathed." Of course, we need not believe it was really so bad as this; and the Bible often shows these annihilated towns and tribes reappearing right afterward, active as ever. But the stories show no less the low ideals of the authors, in both morals and religion. These ideals, however, continued to rise, until the great prophets of the eighth century B.C. not only plead passionately for brotherhood within the nation, but even predicted the union of nations, when swords should be beaten into ploughshares and the world should learn war no more.

But, most important of all, this brotherhood was made the essence of *religion*. It was taught that the Lord cared little for their ceremonies and prayers, wanted no more blood of animals or men, but only that they should "do justly and love mercy." This teaching, though of course unheeded, continued among the best Jews. Rabbi Hillel, in giving the Golden Rule, called it "the substance of the law"; and Jesus called it both "the law and the prophets." Jesus' Beatitudes are all only ethical, and do not hint that religion is anything more. They give the highest blessings to those who "hunger and thirst after righteousness," to "the meek" and "the merciful"; and, if God is mentioned, it is "the pure in heart" who shall see him, the "peace-makers" who shall be called his "sons." It is the simple religion of righteousness and brotherhood. Jesus seems to have cared for little else. He preached "mercy and not sacrifice." He ordered men to leave the altar until they were reconciled to others. This reconciliation was itself the best prayer: "for if ye forgive others, your heavenly Father will forgive you," and he will not otherwise. Forgiveness was the true religion, and must be repeated "seventy times seven" times. This was also taught among his disciples, one of whom wrote that, "if we love one another, God dwelleth in us," for "God is love." Love was itself God and the only way to find him. Saint Jerome tells how John, when an old man, kept repeating, "Love one another"; and how, when asked why he

said no more, he replied that no more was needed. So did early Christianity promise to perfect the union which the Roman empire had brought.

But the promise failed. Between barbarians without and corruption within, that uniting empire went to pieces. Even before it fell, Christianity fell worse,—fell from its high ideals of harmony to things that divided. It separated into sects quarrelling over theological questions. It opposed the social sentiments with ascetic practices, and sought sanctity by fasts and bodily penance rather than by brotherhood. Many a holy hermit abandoned his own children to save his soul, and a nun was said to have been sent to Purgatory for loving her mother too much. Formal observances were again exalted until they seemed holier than innocence itself. Baptism, which Paul once thanked God he had practised so little, came to be thought more important than purity; and ceremonies to atone for a crime seemed more meritorious than not to commit it. Such opinions prevailed for centuries, and Jesus' religion of love was so buried that his professing followers sometimes sought to serve him by slaying each other.

Yet, all this time, the tendency to union was also active, and was aided much by Christianity. Whatever the quarrels of the Church, it still taught brotherhood. Amid all the divisions of the falling empire and of the feudal system, the Christian name and organization kept alive the feeling of unity. Even then Crusades helped to unite Europe, and the wars which followed them were partly redeemed by gathering conquered peoples into great nations again.

But the union has been furthered more by the *secular* forces that revived with the Renaissance. The arts undermined intolerance. Learning linked men of even different religions and races in a common cause and sympathy. Advancing science softened bigotry, and the agnostic spirit began to show the folly of quarrelling over questions about which neither side knew anything. Increasing commerce

joined the nations ever more closely, and economics slowly learned that the interests of each were the interests of all.

The harmony of nations and the folly of their quarrels was also taught more and more by *eminent men*, from Sully and Grotius onward. Voltaire wrote most earnestly against wars. Benjamin Franklin said there never had been and never would be a good one. Jeremy Bentham denounced war as "mischief on the largest scale." Robert Hall condemned it as "the temporary repeal of all the principles of virtue." Carlyle asked whether the French and English soldiers who "blow the souls out of one another" have any real reason for it; and he answered, "Busy as the devil is, not the slightest." Long before General Sherman, Channing said that a battlefield is a vast "exhibition of crime," and that "a more fearful hell in any region of the universe cannot well be conceived." Auguste Comte closed his "Positive Philosophy" with congratulation that the old evil was ending; and at about the same time Emerson wrote that "war is on its last legs" and "begins to look like an epidemic insanity." Charles Sumner called it "international lynch-law" with works "infinitely evil and accursed;" and he said that the greatest value of the Springfield arsenal was that it had inspired Longfellow's poem against war. Theodore Parker wrote, "Posterity will damn into deep infamy that government which allows a war to take place in the middle of the nineteenth century." Even during our Mexican War Parker denounced it as "mean and infamous,"—as not only a "great boy fighting a little one," but as a fight where "the big boy is in the wrong, and tells solemn lies to make his side seem right." So Lowell opposed that war of his own country,—made Hosea Biglow "call it murder," and made Parson Wilbur rebuke it in behalf of a higher "patriotism" and of that truer country which is not territory, but justice. In 1848 and 1849 great Peace Congresses for international arbitration and disarmament met in Brussels and Paris. At the latter Victor Hugo predicted the

day when cannon would be obsolete and seen only in museums as curiosities. Even England, during a whole generation of peace, had reached the "belief that wars were things of the past;" and Buckle soon after wrote that the national taste for them had become "utterly extinct."

The work of union continued, and even the wars that followed were sometimes in its favor. Our own Civil War was in the name of "the Union." Italy was at last united again. The great German empire was organized where a score of petty States had once opposed each other. But union has been advanced most by the peaceful processes of industry, trade, travel, intercourse of every kind. Victor Hugo contrasted the great Industrial Exposition at Paris, where the nations had come together to learn good from each other, with "that terrible international exposition called a battlefield." Even the electric flashes through the Atlantic cable moved Whittier to sing,—

"Weave on, swift shuttle of the Lord,
Beneath the sea so far,
The bridal-robe of earth's accord,
The funeral-shroud of war."

Every peaceable ship is a fuller shuttle for that shroud; every railway-train, with its merchandise and mail, adds its thread to that bridal-robe. Through these secular agencies, human sympathy has already widened until men give their tears and treasure for suffering heathen around the earth whom once they would have thought it sacred duty to slay. The very laws of the world are working for the true Christianity and the final union of mankind.

Not, indeed, that we are near it yet. The nations still try to out-trick each other in trade. In the most "Christian" nations the citizens sometimes do; and possessions are not shared with perfect brotherhood even in the Church. No longer is Ananias struck dead for keeping back part of his property, but he and Sapphira sit safely in their pew, with no question about their land. No longer is Dives sent

to "hell" on account of his wealth, but has become a deacon, and the preacher has found a way to get the camel through the needle's eye. Nor is Lazarus as peaceful as he used to be. He is ready to dynamite, not Dives only, but every Lazarus who will not join his strike to cut off the country's needed coal or beef.

For the spirit of *violence* still survives to rend society. It inspires not only the poor and ignorant, but their leaders and rulers, and sometimes takes possession of a nation. That long dream of peace to which we have referred was broken by a most destructive series of wars. Those of the ten years ending in 1871 are said by Mulhall to have cost nearly a million and a half of lives and nearly six billions of dollars. Since then the armaments in Europe have much further increased. A standard new History tells us that the "civilized Christian nations" now occupying the old Roman territory, though no longer in danger from outside barbarians, yet keep "under arms ten or twelve times the forces" of the pagan emperors. Military expenditures are vastly greater than any other. Even in our own country, in 1899, the Naval and War Departments and pensions consumed nearly three-fourths of the entire expenditures of the national government. President Eliot recently reminded us that the sum granted to our great Agricultural Department for a year was "about the cost of one day of the war with Spain;" while the annual amount given to the beneficent work of fish-culture was less than that spent in maintaining one battleship. Fifty years ago Charles Sumner said: "Every ship of war that floats costs more than a well-endowed college; every sloop of war, more than the largest library in our country." To-day battleships are far more costly and numerous, and eminent Americans who profess much zeal for Christ want to increase them.

They want to use them, too; and even preachers are not always opposed to this. General Francis A. Walker wrote, in 1869, that in five years' pretty constant attendance at

church, and in listening to sermons from fifty different pulpits, he had "not heard a single discourse which was devoted to the primitive Christian idea of peace, or which contained a perceptible strain of argument or appeal for international good will." A few years ago we kept our Christmas season of "peace on earth" by a clamor for a mighty war with England about a Venezuelan boundary. Our people and press had just been crying out against the horror of a proposed pugilistic fight between two fools in Texas, but now became eager to send into the ring half a million Christians to engage in battles beside which prize-fights would be bland and benevolent. Some even argued that our national character would be ennobled by a war, and our moral tone improved by bombarding a few towns and butchering their people. The excitement passed, and how that boundary question was settled few now know or care. But we have since tried that method of ethical training, though on a much smaller and safer scale. The ideals of the battlefield and of the "water-cure" have spread among the people, yet without the predicted moral improvement. Indeed, violence seems to have become unusually popular, strikers club and kill other workmen with medieval ardor, and now and then a community gathers with the greatest delight to watch the writhings of a negro burning to death. In pessimistic moments one sometimes feels that our civilization is little more than a film, beneath which the old savagery is still seething.

These evils, however, are exceptional, and we must not make too much of them. A little bad gets all attention, while the great current of good goes on unheeded, just because it is so great and common. The bad may even be a sign of progress; and part of the violence to-day is a passionate outcry against wrongs that have long been allowed and that must be ended. But, amid the violence, peaceful methods are advancing, and arbitration is more and more settling labor troubles and preventing wars. Even the

wars that do come are no longer between the foremost nations, but have mostly sunk into expeditions of some powerful people to conquer some feeble one. Even these inglorious conquests have become so difficult and expensive that they will not often be attempted; while real war between two great powers would be so vastly more so that M. Bloch pronounced it already impossible. Certainly, war seems destined to die at length by its own growth, to kill itself by its costliness. Even now two equal nations could not long continue it without the bankruptcy of both.

So do the laws of progress work for peace. A wise man, when challenged, replied that any fool can propose a duel, but it takes two fools to fight. The nations will yet learn this. Already they are questioning the wisdom of wasting most of their wealth in endless preparation for wars which can be avoided and which cannot come without mutual ruin. Already they see a fallacy in the system which spends millions on a battleship that soon becomes useless by the invention of a better one, and which is forever improving walls to resist cannon, and then improving cannon to destroy the walls. They begin to see the folly of fortifying boundaries at infinite expense, when that long one between us and British America has been safe for nearly a century, without walls or warship, by mere mutual agreement. They see something worse than folly in the system which uses our noble youth like Falstaff's ragamuffins,—as "food for powder" and "to fill a pit,"—and sometimes to fulfil viler purposes. For the moral fallacy, too, is more and more seen. Why condemn brutality and crime at home, and then cultivate them abroad? Why hang for killing one man, and honor for killing a hundred? Why imprison a starving woman for stealing a loaf, and then praise rulers or soldiers for looting cities and stealing a whole country? Shall justice be abolished by a national boundary, and the moral law stop at the State line?

Emerson once said, "The arch-abolitionist, older than

John Brown and older than the Shenandoah Mountains, is Love, whose other name is Justice, which was before Alfred, before Lycurgus, before slavery, and will be after it." That same Love and Justice, older than battleships or the brutality that wants them, is still here,—was alive before wars began, and will be after they are ended.

Doubtless this principle of union will work on until it links all nations by just laws and settles their quarrels by peaceful courts. It will also unite all classes in them. It will not, however, cement society in any spiritless communism like an archaic sponge or bind men in any tyrannic labor union which denies liberty to its members. For individualism also has been an aim in Nature,—from rushing worlds to roaming bees and soaring birds and free souls. The perfect system will combine fraternity with freedom,—“liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever.”

This principle will perfect religion also. So ancient prophets and apostles taught. So the best modern ones have taught. Dr. Putnam said the one thing he worked for was “the sense of universal unity and brotherhood.” Dr. Channing not only made this his chief aim, but saw it as the substance of religion, and said, “The love of God is but another name for the love of essential benevolence and justice.” So Emerson declared this sentiment not only “the essence of all religion,” but the essence of Deity: “If a man is at heart just, then in so far is he God; the immortality of God, the majesty of God, do enter into that man with justice.” These words seemed profane, but they are almost the same which the apostle wrote: “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us,” for “God is love.” Some pious people slur love as “not religion,” but “only ethics.” Only ethics! Only love; that is, according to the apostle, only *God*! But this is exactly what pious people were seeking. The “cosmic roots of love” are also those of religion.

Such is the sweep of this principle of union. It is indeed a "cosmic" principle, working from the nebula to now,—from the primal atoms to the perfect civilization and religion. The great Kant adored two wonders,—the stars above and the moral law within. But the two wonders are one, and all the more wonderful because one. The moral law within is the higher music of the same law which "the morning stars sang together" and have been singing ever since. It is sung ever more clearly through creation,—from solar systems up to human society, from nebular mist up to minds that outshine the stars, and to souls and sentiments that hope to outlast the stars. It has brought love. Rather, it is love, and has been love from the first. Its lesson is to work for love now, and to trust the Love eternal.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE
Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
- Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
- Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES
Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR
By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
- Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR
London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND
Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
- Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
- Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
- Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
- Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
- Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
- Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD
- THE WASTE OF MILITARISM
From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
- THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

-
- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOL. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

THE IMPUDENCE OF CHARLATANISM.*

It is with considerable surprise that we find in the well-known magazine *Taiyo* the advertisement of a translation into Japanese of Mr. Homer Lea's notorious book, "The Valor of Ignorance," as being published by a respectable Japanese publishing house such as the Hakubunkwan. This publishing house issues such well-known magazines as the *Taiyo* and the *Bungei Club*, and is responsible for the appearance of a large number of the most important Japanese books. Yet it does not seem to regard the publication of a translation of Mr. Homer Lea's book as likely to reflect unfavorably upon its reputation. Probably this is because the Hakubunkwan is unaware of Mr. Lea's reputation among his fellow-countrymen and other foreign residents. The advertisement, which would seem to have been inspired by Mr. Lea, shows considerable impudence. It is there stated that the

* There is perhaps no more glaring recent illustration of the charlatanism and mischief-making with which the movement for international justice has constantly to contend than the book entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," by Homer Lea, published a few years ago. Its sensational declarations about the warlike purposes of Japan and the helplessness of the American people to defend themselves from attack created a feeling among hundreds of readers little short of hysterical. The author styled himself "General" Homer Lea; and "General" Lea has become almost as notorious as Captain Hobson in the chronic effort to keep alive the Japanese war-scare. His readers have believed that he was some military expert, and that his terrifying contentions were entitled to consideration. It seems a duty to expose these charlatans, because they do distinct damage with uninformed and unthinking people. The publication of a Japanese translation of this absurd and pestiferous book in Tokyo makes this a proper occasion to expose more widely its real character and that of its writer; and perhaps, among the various critical exposures which might be published, there is no brief one better than the article here reprinted from the *Japan Chronicle* of February 11, 1912. The article is followed by a letter to the *San Francisco Chronicle* by President Jordan, of Stanford University, referred to by the writer of the article in the Japanese newspaper, in which Dr. Jordan, who happens to know all about this "General" Homer Lea, characterizes him as he deserves. It is to be hoped that we shall see no more exhibitions of "valor" from this particular charlatan; but, unhappily, his tribe is a large one.—*Editor*.

author of "The Valor of Ignorance" is "General Homer Lea, an American Staff Officer," though as a matter of fact this person has absolutely no connection with the American army. As will be seen by a letter from Dr. Jordan, of the Stanford University, which appears in another column, Mr. Lea has not had any military training or education, nor has he at any time held a military office in America. Dr. Jordan says he was a second-year student in the Stanford University, that he went to Canton in 1900, where he joined a secret society of agitators, and returned to America with a title which he translates as "Lieutenant-General." From other sources we learn that for a short time Mr. Lea was an officer in a company of Chinese cadets in California. After returning to America from China, he became a contributor to magazines and a writer of books. According to a sketch of his life published in "Who's Who in America," "General" Lea "undertook the relief of Kwang Hsu, Emperor of China, in 1900-01; he raised and commanded the Second Army Division in 1904, holding rank of Lieutenant-General over these forces." When a well-known book of reference allows such statements to appear, it is perhaps not surprising that Japanese translators or publishers should believe there is some ground for the claims made by Mr. Lea. They may perhaps be surprised to learn that there was any attempt made to relieve the Emperor Kwang Hsu, and they may wonder how it comes about that no mention of such an expedition has ever been made by any reputable authority on China; but the "Second Division" sounds good and imposing. When the compilers of "Who's Who in America" allowed Mr. Lea to pose in its pages as a "Lieutenant-General" commanding the "Second Army Division," it doubtless never occurred to them that this designation, presumably applied to Californian Chinese cadets, would be understood in Japan as having reference to the regular American forces.

Those who have read "The Valor of Ignorance" will be aware that it is written to make the flesh of Americans creep. Those who have not read it may judge of its style from Mr. Lea's fierce denunciation of the advocates of International Arbitration as "visionaries who are striving through subservient politicians, feminism, clericalism, sophism, and other such toilers (*sic*), to drag this already much deluded Republic into that Brobdingnagian

swamp from whose deadly gases there is no escape." This sounds very terrible, but all that it means is that, in Mr. Lea's view, there is no such thing as international justice,—that all nations are subject to the Law of Struggle, the Law of Survival, and that the fittest to survive will be those who pile up armaments, decorate coast-lines with fortifications, and devote laborious days to protecting themselves from possible aggression. Any plan to thwart the Law of Survival, he says, "to short-cut it, to circumvent it, is folly such as man's conceit alone makes possible. Never has this been tried—and man is ever at it—but the end has been gangrenous and fatal." How a law can be "short-cutted" we do not know, and why, having been short-cutted, the end should be gangrenous, is somewhat of a mystery; but the book has had a large sale, and we suppose appeals to minds which like to be shocked and made to shudder, knowing all the time there is no real occasion for it. "General" Homer Lea pretends to set forth the plans of Japan against the United States. He pictures a great expedition setting forth from Japan for the capture of America. Like a genuine patriot, he indicates what he regards as weak places which the Japanese would immediately seize, and where they would throw up earth works and protect the landing of their troops. As a result, the Japanese would reach a position to make their own terms, and thus the "valor of ignorance" is shown to be quite ineffective in the protection of the national security.

We learn that this precious bundle of nonsense was translated into Japanese some months ago, but the late government refused to give permission for its publication. Needless to say, we do not defend such interference with free speech. Apart from those matters of public morality upon which general agreement exists, government censorship is always to be deprecated. But private individuals or companies have a perfect right to say whether or not they will lend their services for the dissemination of a work which seeks to commend itself to public notice by a falsehood, and it is for this reason that we express surprise at finding the Haku-bunkwan associating itself with such a work or advertising it by the methods adopted in the *Taiyo*. There, as we have already stated, the work is declared to be by "General Homer Lea, an American Staff Officer," a statement that is entirely false and

calculated to discredit the officers of the American army. Its title in the Japanese version is not "The Valor of Ignorance," but "The War between Japan and America," the future being understood. Already, it is alleged, the work has reached its seventeenth edition,—apparently abroad,—and it is commended to the Japanese as a book which is arousing "the chivalrous spirit of the European and American nations." Presumably this statement is made on the authority of the writer, for we observe that the book contains not only a portrait of the famous "General," but a letter from him. As it is recognized that "The War between Japan and America," with its suggestion that the Japanese are in a position to conquer the United States, may possibly have considerable influence in Chauvinistic circles, the advertisement says, "Our countrymen should beware of pride after reading this book, for in that case they will suffer insult." Then follows a description of the work, which is worth giving at some length:—

"The translation has now been published of the 'Valor of Ignorance'—at present the most popular book in the world (*sic*). The author, notwithstanding the fact that he is an American staff officer, has been bold enough to deal with the question of war between Japan and America, and in connection therewith even predicts a great victory for Japan. Now he admires Bushido and sheds tears upon the tombstones of the Forty-seven Samurai; now he worships from afar at the Shokonsha [the shrine at Kudan, Tokyo, for the reception of those who fell in the war], and eulogizes the august Mikado of Japan. Then he is indignant at the spiritless Americans who are sunk in commercialism. Truly his utterance must arouse the world with its fervent concern for his country! The U.S. Government purchased copies of the book from the first edition down to the tenth: the Kaiser bought tens of thousands of copies of the book for distribution among his officers and men of both services. Then British millionaires, startled at this, laid out twenty thousand sterling, and endeavored to counteract its effect by hastily establishing a peace movement. All these facts demonstrate how universally popular is this book. The translator has traveled in China and French Indo-China, and immediately on his return home contributed a long serial to the *Osaka Asahi* entitled 'An Eye Witness's Account of the Chinese Revolution'—a contribution which was greatly appreciated by its readers. Such is the extraordinary history of the translator. He has now acquired the copyright of the translation, and has brandished his vigorous arm. . . . More interesting than a novel, more mysterious than philosophy, this is really excellent reading matter for Oriental men with red blood in their veins."

From this it would seem that the translator has almost as exalted an opinion of himself as the author. The interest of the American Government and the Kaiser in the book, the "chivalry" that is being aroused in Europe and America, to say nothing of the fear which spiritless British millionaires have of the teachings of the valiant "General," and their hurried organization of a peace movement by way of counteraction,—it is all too funny for serious criticism. But the curious fact is that such a book as this is put forth by a reputable Japanese publishing house, and seriously advertised in terms that are reminiscent of the most extreme parody of braggadocio in words, without any one, apparently, seeing in it aught that is amiss. It will be interesting to note the effect of the publication of this absurd book in Japan. We can only hope that our vernacular contemporaries who believe that Japan's future lies in the ways of peaceful progress will expose the pretensions of the writer and translator of "The War between Japan and America." A man who takes a title to which he has no right is a charlatan. He is not entitled to credit, more especially when he makes a great parade of patriotism, and his sincerity may justly be questioned.—*The Japan Chronicle*, Kobe, February 11, 1912.

"THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CHRONICLE":

Sir,—Professor Fujizawa of the University at Tokyo tells me that Homer Lea's "The Valor of Ignorance" has been translated into Japanese in lurid fashion, under the title of "The Future War between Japan and America." I do not know whether you have noticed the book or not, but you will find it singularly worthless. It represents the old military theory of the times of Napoleon, of which Lea has been a persistent student, and it totally neglects moral and financial values, as, for instance, when he says that "no nation was ever poorer by a single potato" for its expenditures in armament and war!

I wish to say, also, if the book should come before your notice, that this so-called "General" Lea has not and never had any connection with the United States Army, nor with any other recognized army. He was a second-year student in Stanford University, went to Canton

in 1900, joined some secret society of agitators, and came back soon with a title from this society which he translates as Lieutenant-General.

The book is worthless, and may be mischievous in its influence. It pretends to give a detailed account of the plans of Japan against the United States, and also gives an account of how and where they will probably land to carry out these plans. It would be unfortunate if anybody in Japan should consider him as a representative of the American army.

Very truly yours,

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 10, 1912.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE
Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
- Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
- Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES
Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR
By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
- Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR
London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND
Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
- Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
- Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
- Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
- Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
- Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
- Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS

Without Serial Number

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD

THE WASTE OF MILITARISM

From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living

THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

-
- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

WORLD SCOUTS

BY

ALBERT JAY NOCK

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

APRIL, 1912, No. 5, Part IV

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOL. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

Foreword

THE Boy Scout movement has had, during the last half dozen years, a most rapid growth and has become one of the most remarkable movements among boys throughout almost the whole world. In England especially it has attained immense popularity, and to-day there is hardly a city or village in the kingdom without its Boy Scouts. It is estimated that there are no less than 300,000 in this country. Indeed we think the first suggestion of the Boy Scouts came from Ernest Thompson Seton, who, although born in England, is more of an American than an Englishman. But the movement attained importance in this country some time after it had become important in England, and its chief leader has been General Baden-Powell. The original idea in starting the movement was to organize groups of boys for outdoor life, the study of the woods and natural history, and training in healthy, resolute and useful life and habits. One rule or motto of the movement is "To do a good turn to some one every day," and the good turn may take any form, from helping a comrade out of a scrape or sharing some little pleasure with him to leading a blind man across the street or giving something to eat to a lost dog. The movement has in it a great deal to commend, both as concerns education and the development of character. It demands critical attention from the peace workers of the world simply because of the military tendencies and enthusiasms which easily attach to it, and to which the great military party, especially in Great Britain, has so sedulously worked to divert it. So largely is this true that in many places in Great Britain its patrons are chiefly military men, and no pains are spared to make it a feeder of the military service. In Russia the advent of the movement has been officially hailed on account of its military promise and possibilities; and it is against this effort to capture the movement for military purposes that the peace party in this country, as in all countries, while freely and frankly recognizing the virtues in the movement, needs to be warned and to be alert.

We should not fail to state that leaders of the movement, like General Baden-Powell, strongly declare their purpose to keep it emphatically a peace movement. In his various addresses during his visit to America in the spring of 1912, General Baden-Powell constantly struck this note. He said in one of his Boston addresses :

War is a very easy thing to recommend, but a very bad thing to enter upon and put through. War is a form of authorized murder, and dirty at that, and there is not one of us who does not want, and would not do anything, to put a stop to it. That is why we ask the boys to join the Boy Scout movement. We are essentially a peace organization, trying to help on the education of the people in these matters. We want to develop a spirit of manliness, fair play, and chivalry in the rising generation. Our movement is not confined to any one nation; it is practically universal, and I hope that it will prove to be a step toward universal peace.

In New York he said :

I have often said that if the government will give us the price of a dreadnaught, we will make dreadnaughts unnecessary. We are training the rising generation in the idea of peace, and the boys of all the nations which have taken up the movement are now friendly and interchange ideas and letters.

Yet the meeting of welcome for General Baden-Powell, organized at the 71st Regiment armory in New York by 3000 Boy Scouts and their friends, took chiefly a military form; "much of the afternoon there were scenes of mimic warfare on the floor of the drill-room," etc. The men invited to places upon the platform in connection with the various meetings were also chiefly military men, usually in uniform. We emphasize thus the two strains in the movement, to make its two sides perfectly clear.

It was the recognition of the abuses and dangers of the movement in England which led to the organization there by Sir Francis Vane of the "World Scout" movement, described in the present leaflet. Mr. Nock's interesting paper is here reprinted not only for the sake of its account of the World Scout organization, but because it states so admirably and justly both the excellences and the dangers of these movements generally. Sir Francis Vane is quite right in seeing that the proper hunger and enthusiasm of boys for the heroic and adventurous is just as readily satisfied by good things as by bad; and that it accuses fathers, mothers and teachers if the good things are not provided in proper form, and especially if the right kind of books and papers are not provided for our boys and girls instead of the vulgar and bloodthirsty rubbish which old people think the young want. "They do not want it," says Sir Francis, "but in lieu of anything else they take it because it is exciting. If we, who are apostles of Peace, would only come to some clear understanding as to the methods by which we may direct the thoughts of the young toward Unity, we have conquered the world for Peace. . . .

"The only way in which warfare for Peace is possible among the young is by making them enthusiastic for Unity, and, instead of speaking of the beauties of Peace, giving them a vent for their youthful desire for adventure through knight-errantry and public service. The great difficulty has been that Peace has been made to appear too passive a thing for children, with too much of the commonplace about it. Strike the note of Unity under an order, colored and adventurous and romantic — because after all war has been pictured for all these centuries as something out of the commonplace — and you win them for Peace. Round a camp fire or in a club room any man who knows what war is can dispel the illusion by telling a few home truths about it. . . . The children are not naturally divided into race or class. The good God never created a child who was either a race fanatic or a class one — we make them both by our archaic ideas. Starting on this natural basis of Unity in childhood, we who believe in Peace can get them all if we are wise."

E. D. M.

WORLD SCOUTS

BY ALBERT JAY NOCK

Reprinted by permission from the *American Magazine*, January, 1912

DURING the first week of September, two vastly important meetings were held on opposite sides of the English Channel.

On the north side of the Channel, at Portsmouth, the British Association, fifteen hundred strong, met to consider the world's supply of *energy* and the problem of what to do with it.

On the south side, at Hardelot, near Boulogne, a camp of eighty boys came together in the interest of the world's supply of *manhood*, and the problem of making it as good as possible.

It was a camp of Scouts, who had gone over from England under the leadership of Sir Francis Vane, for a week's outing.

I had seen Scouts in England, sometimes marching and countermarching by squads in the parks, sometimes by twos and threes in the busy parts of the city, apparently scouting the streets. I noticed that they always walked fast and seemed to be intent on something; also, that they looked a bit happier and brighter than English children usually do. But I paid no particular attention to them, because I was not interested.

Like every one else I had looked into the Scout movement when it first came out, but I could not see much in it except a sort of kindergarten for militarism, so I promptly lost interest. The Scout principles were good, but in the background there was always the idea that war and fighting — fighting other people — are inevitable and often praiseworthy. It was this tacit acceptance of war as a commonplace of life that made me think the Scout movement was likely to do a great deal more harm than good. At the head of the movement were Lord Roberts, General Baden-Powell, Lord Charles Beresford, and others like them — a first-class military cabal. I doubted whether these men were fitted to give a proper educational direction to a movement of boys. In fact, I was sure they were not. Then, too, I knew that the South African War had made England very nervous about her future fighting stock — and the Scouts were being trained to arms and told by their leaders that "we know for whom we are preparing!" So I decided that as far as civilization was concerned, the Scout movement was detrimental and retarding.

But one morning I read in the London papers an account of a thirteen-year-old boy who had gone into a burning house and carried out a baby. The little

fellow took a risk that grown-ups would not take. It was one of the bravest, finest things I ever heard of. The baby's father offered him a reward, but he refused it, saying, "No, it is my job—I'm a World Scout."

That got me interested again. I had never heard of that kind of thing being part of a Scout's job. I noticed, too, that the small hero called himself a *World Scout*. That sounded better.

I had been done to death with the insurmountable, cramping insularity of England, and it was a comfort to hear the word "world" in an English mouth. I began to think that either I had overlooked something or that there were two kinds of Scouts; and I presently found out that there are indeed two kinds of Scouts, differing precisely on those issues which had influenced my own interest.

There are the Boy Scouts—we have thousands of them in the United States—and the World Scouts. The points of difference are these:

The Boy Scout is trained to believe in two artificial, false, old-fashioned, and utterly exploded ideas—ideas that the world has no use for. First, he is taught to believe in the existence of a large class of beings called *foreigners*. Second, that it is normal, right, and above all very glorious and interesting to oppose these beings occasionally in the institution called *warfare*.

The World Scout, on the other hand, is in these respects not trained at all. He is simply allowed and encouraged to keep the natural, true, clear vision of human beings that he was born with. He is permitted to grow up in the plain, natural truth that there are no *foreigners*, and that warfare—modern warfare—is neither glorious nor interesting, but, on the contrary, very sordid and stupid.

Let us leave Scout history a moment and take a little gossiping detour around these two ideas, to see whether the World Scouts are building on a sound foundation.

We have always heard of *foreigners*. For most of us the world is divided into two classes—foreigners and folks. But did you ever ask yourself the simple question, *What is a foreigner?* Wherein do foreigners really and vitally differ from folks?

I asked myself that question first a couple of years ago, when I was seeing more or less of the shirt-waist strike in New York. The strikers were *foreigners*,—so the papers said,—but I got rather well acquainted with a number of them and discovered that they were so much like folks that I could not tell the difference. For all I could see, they were just like anybody else. So I could not answer my own question.

Then I went to the men of science, the travelers, and found them the worst people of all to go to, because they answered all kinds of questions except the one I wanted answered. I learned all about clothes and languages and social customs, and so forth, but never a word did I find to tell me what a foreigner is, or what there is in his nature that makes him different from you or me.

Science has that way of disappointing you. I remember, perhaps ten years ago, I wanted a plain answer to the question, *What is a criminal?* — because I had been hearing so much just then about *the criminal class*. So I went to the criminologists — Lombroso, Laschi, Garofalo, and others — and read their books. They told me all about the shape of men's ears and the influence of hot and cold weather, and heredity, and a great many other things, but they did not tell me what a criminal is, or what the criminal class is, and I have never found out to this day; though I have asked many lawyers too, and after a great deal of talk and argument, it always turned out that they did not know.

No more did the scientific travelers tell me what a foreigner is. So when it came my turn to do a little traveling, I thought I would find out for myself. English-speaking people kept talking to me about "picturesque foreigners," "interesting foreigners," "beastly foreigners." So I was greatly keyed up to see for myself what foreigners were like, and I was told that Naples was just the place to see them.

Almost the first thing I noticed in Naples was a dog. He came up to my table at a sidewalk café, sat down, cocked his ear, and declared himself. I spoke to him in English and he moved his tail faintly. Then I tried him in Italian and we became fast friends at once. He seemed to me just like an American dog, and for his part did not appear to trouble himself about my "foreign extraction." We had a first-rate visit together and were both frankly sorry when it came time to part.

Then I went out to the park where the Aquarium is, and found a horde of children playing. They seemed as natural and homelike as though I had met them in Central Park, and when I offered to take a hand in their sport, they swarmed around me in droves, as friendly as children could be. It was impossible for me to differentiate them from American children except by language, which is a very superficial matter.

To make a long story short, I have had this identical experience with adults, children, dogs, cats, horses, and chickens all over Italy, France, and England. I am still unable to answer the question, *What is a foreigner?*

Now suppose the United States should get involved in the present trouble between Italy and Turkey: I would be supposed to go and help shoot people whom I have found to be precisely like myself and my neighbors in my home town, and who have been kind and good to me without exception.

One would not want to do that. So long as one believes there are foreigners, one would perhaps as lief shoot them as not. But when one finds that the people he supposed were foreigners are really not foreigners but folks, one looks at it differently.

I have gone through all this to show that when one gets done explaining *foreigners*, one finds that one has gone only in a big circle back to the attitude of mind that one was born with. A child does not know the difference between a *foreigner* and anybody else. He does not know it because there is no

difference. The person or society that tries to teach him that there is a difference does a great wrong against nature, a wrong that it may take him a lifetime to right, if indeed he ever rights it.

The World Scout is allowed to go on looking at people as they really are, and to take them as he finds them, which is the right way to take them; not as he thinks they must be or ought to be. A boy will keep that point of view easily, if he is permitted, because it is natural to him. This explains part of the great success of the World Scouts.

The World Scout, too, is permanently enlisted for peace, not by having peace preached to him, for that could not interest him a moment. But as he is allowed to see the plain, simple truth about human beings, so he is allowed to see the plain truth about war. As he learns that society tries to deceive him about the difference between foreigners and folks, so he finds that society puts up a shocking deception on him about war.

Boys can be easily taught to like the idea of war, because of their instinct of chivalry and their instinct of adventure. Every boy is born a knight-errant; always a going in quest of stirring experience. Hence mischief oftentimes. You can lay finger on nothing in all the immortal knavery of Huck Finn and Tom Sawyer that is not traceable straightway to those two instincts of chivalry and adventure. They are born with the boy, born with his inestimable blessing of imagination and "pretending," and they control him until they are evaporated by the dusty atmosphere of these unchivalrous days.

The idea of war fascinates him, *if he is properly lied to about it*. Hence society gets up a system of lies, exactly calculated to hoodwink the boy's instincts of chivalry and adventure. The uniforms and music, the pageantry and gorgeousness of war — these all speak of splendid adventure and are all lies. The political excuses that nations put up when they declare war, — "benevolent protectorates," "training people for self-government," "the white man's burden," and such like, — all these speak of splendid chivalry, and they are all lies.

The World Scout is allowed to see modern warfare as it really is. Not a fight against foreigners and enemies, because there are no foreigners, and those we call foreigners are not enemies, but quite the opposite. Not an adventure in chivalry, because there is no more real adventure or glory of chivalry in modern war than there is in going out into the back yard and shooting the cow.

Arthur's knights would fare forth looking for the Holy Grail or questing adventure in behalf of weakness oppressed or beauty captive. The Crusaders went out to free the sepulcher of the Saviour. This was real chivalry and real adventure, and the story of it warms the cockles of a boy's heart, because it is a disinterested, aboveboard appeal to an instinct that is true, right and natural.

But would Arthur's knights buckle up and get busy because the American trusts wanted to exploit the Philippine Islands, or a handful of freebooters wanted to dig diamonds in South Africa, or some German manufacturers wanted to peddle their knickknacks around Morocco?

When your ten-year-old boy gets through reading Sir Thomas Malory, ask him that question and watch him grin from ear to ear. He will think you have gone crazy. So, too, if we had kept his clear, natural view of things as they are, would we think our governments were crazy — or criminal.

When Tristram or Lancelot met the oppressor of innocence or the jailer of beauty, they met face to face a lance length apart, and somebody had to take the dust. They knew each other and knew what the trouble was. And each knew which was right and which was wrong. This was adventure.

But would Tristram or Lancelot see any adventure in roosting all day behind a pile of mud, while an invisible man half a mile away took pot shots at him with a high-power rifle — a man, mind, that he had never seen or heard of before, who had nothing against him and no particular interest in the cause of war, and ten chances to one was a first-rate fellow whom one could not help liking if one tried?

England has begun equipping with a gun that will carry twenty-one miles — so the papers say. How Simon de Montfort would enjoy a siege nowadays! The naval end of it carried on at twenty-one miles' range! Can you imagine him directing the movements of a land force that he cannot see, from a tent so far away that he can scarcely hear the rifle fire of the battle? Imagine Roland or Bayard four miles to the rear, moving invisible troops by telegraph and getting reports from aeroplane scouts with a wireless attachment.

Put in a stock ticker and the baseball returns and the whole picture is alive with chivalry and adventure — reeks with it.

Well, all this — the simple unvarnished truth about modern war — is what the World Scout is permitted to go on seeing.

Now, being turned off from following a false ideal of chivalry, the Scout learns indirectly how to get at the true. Scouts are started out in twos and threes, as I was continually seeing them in the London streets, to find something good that needs doing and do it. Perhaps it is some old woman that needs to be piloted over a crowded crossing; perhaps a cat or dog to be rescued from cruelty; perhaps a child to be fished out of the Thames. (I read of several such rescues by the Scouts.) Scouts beat out the heather fires that were started in this summer of record heat and drought. The case of the child rescued from the fire is in point. The Scout was looking for anything that was in his line, the opportunity came, — a very serious one, — and he was on the job.

The everlasting love of adventure, — the fun of never knowing what is going to turn up, — that is what holds the Scouts to their work. Any one who realizes what a hunting, trailing, yes, in a good sense, gambling creature a boy is by nature can see at once how efficient the motive is. All the strongest factors of boy life come into play, — the "gang instinct," emulation, imitation, competition, — all work powerfully together for good, if the good is once seen to be (as again, it really is) an *adventure*.

But the World Scout soon finds out that if he wants to be efficient in the game of chivalry, he must train for it. A hard body, a quick and active mind, and a tender heart — he can't do business without them. And he *will* train — because he has an incentive, and an *immediate* incentive. Not the prospect of distinguishing himself in some remotely possible war with France ten years hence — his chance to distinguish himself may come to-morrow. A runaway horse might break loose at four this afternoon, or a child fall in the river at sundown. So he digs in and trains with might and main.

There are some curious features in their training. I saw several Scouts running in and out of the Underground station at the Bank — appearing and disappearing like prairie dogs. I found that they were training their sense of direction. The Bank station is a maze — our Grand Central subway station is nothing to it. These little chaps would get their bearings, dive down this labyrinth and run around it this way and that, and box the compass as they went.

Scouts know the time of trains in their towns, the route of street cars, the layout of streets and how the numbers run, the best way to stop a runaway horse, the elements of first aid, how to swim and run properly, and what to do with an incipient fire.

They learn how to look after themselves in the open, — how to build a brush tent, cook, sew, how to know birds, herbs, trees, in a practical way. They spend as much time as possible outdoors and in camp. They are not trained in the use of weapons because they never expect to need them.

So much for what the Scouts are; now a word about their history, most of which turns on the personality of one man.

This is Sir Francis Vane, sixth in line from the Sir Harry Vane of Cromwell's time, who had a foot in both worlds, having held office in England and afterwards in New England as governor of Massachusetts. Sir Francis Vane is an aristocrat of the purest type, by birth, appearance, manner, intelligence, and, at the same time, one of the best democrats living.

There is a point where aristocracy and democracy merge and become indistinguishable. This point is called *noblesse oblige*, and Sir Francis Vane is always at that point. All of him is there all the time. That is why boyhood takes him in at once and will stick to him as long as there is any of him left. He is tall, soldierly, fine-looking. He volunteered for service in the South African War, went through it with credit, — two medals and five crosses, — and having done his duty by his country, went home and wrote his book, "Pax Britannica in South Africa," in which he takes the skin off his country's war policy in fifty places at once.

Sir Francis was one of the principal organizers of the original Scouts, in 1903, with General Baden-Powell. But seeing the movement captured by the military cabal and fast degenerating into mere Lilliputian militarism, — the cradle class of an English army, — he branched off and organized the new body.

Not as an inimical organization, however, nor even as rivals in a secular sense, because, as he says, there must be brotherhood between Scouts of all orders, as long as they keep the Scout law. In fact, the relations between the Boy Scouts and the World Scouts are curiously close and cordial. Sir Francis Vane has simply put up the world ideal of brotherhood and universal service alongside the ideal of insularity and militarism, and let the two speak for themselves.

It has been a wonderful success. In the few months of their existence, the muster roll has gone up to fifty thousand, and growing daily by shoals. There are World Scouts of England, Australia, France, Germany, even of Russia. Mr. Slobodyanikov, Master of the First Classical Gymnasium at Kherson, was in London in July and addressed a Scout parade at Southwark. Italy has Scout corps in thirty-five cities and villages. The king of England reviewed them recently, and many of the most prominent Italians are engaged in the movement.

There are Scout corps in South Africa carrying as many as six nationalities in the same company — Boers, English, "Doppers," Kafirs, Zulus and Portuguese. In England there are several Quaker companies.

The World Scouts publish a weekly paper, at present a modest six-page sheet, without advertising matter; but by the time this article is published, it will have changed to magazine form. It will represent a very neat bit of journalistic enterprise. There is at present no good child's paper in Italy, and France is hardly up to the mark. The Scouts propose to turn their periodical into a first-class general child's magazine, with the Scout idea still to the front, of course — and print it in three languages.

This is the way Sir Francis Vane outlines the object of the movement:

We, who are World Scouts, are out for *service and unity*. I ask you to think what little unity there has been in the past. Every silly ass has talked of brotherhood, and done nothing for it. Churches, freemasons, political parties, have preached fraternity until the very name of the thing has become sloppy. Why is this? Because behind it there was no reality. It was a brotherhood of dogma, of the dinner table, of the pocket — always of the pocket. We, who are World Scouts, whether we are British Scouts, Italian Scouts, French or German, commence our work by first accepting the brotherhood of all. We commence it by the brotherhood of the young and the old, by preaching that only by the close intercourse of the young with the old can the young become wise and the old become sympathetic, enthusiastic, and young in spirit.

It is the duty of every man to attempt to have done with war, if for no other reason than this, that war kills not only some of the best men, the men the world requires in peace, and the world wants them alive, not dead; but no less that war destroys not only the men in the field, but it starves out of existence thousands of the tender young at home by the depletion of the nation's capital squandered in its operations.

And I hold it as criminal, as profane, to allow a girl or boy to be brought up in the belief that war is inevitable, a part of the divine ordinance; for he who believes it so will, consciously or unconsciously, make it so, and in so doing he can have no true belief in the mercy of God.

The original Scout movement was a stroke of genius, nothing else. All honor to Sir Robert Baden-Powell for it. His scheme was one of the few that light up the centuries. It interpreted the instincts and aspirations of boyhood and suggested the direction they should take. Too much cannot be said for it; it cannot be overpraised. But the collective selfishness that we miscall patriotism laid hold of it and drove it awry. Selfishness in boy, man or nation is bound to go wrong. Now the thing is, to show the organizers of the original Scout movement that they have made a false step. The ideal of patriotism to be set before boys is the ideal of the World Scouts—an ideal that has no spark of racial animosity. Let the boys understand that the country has so many real enemies that it is a pity to waste time and strength against imaginary ones.

Let the boys keep the natural world-outlook that they were born with. Let them go on believing that Italian and Russian boys are not enemies, but friends; not foreigners, but folks. Because it *is so*. The "patriotic" separatist view is simply not straight—even if our public schools do implicitly teach it by their "patriotic" exercises. It is based on an enormous misunderstanding of fact. There are no foreigners, and no natural enemies.

Let the boys cultivate a chivalry that knows its real dragons and fights them. Let them find the rich mine of adventure that lies in relieving the oppressed, defense of the suffering, protection of the weak. Let them seek adventure in saving life rather than destroying it.

There is no place to do all this like America, no boys as well equipped for this world movement as our boys. We are not familiar with militarism; it is not part of our daily life, as it unfortunately is in other countries. We are a peace-loving people, and having troubles of our own, we don't borrow our neighbors'. America, with its half million Boy Scouts already enrolled, is the very place to effect a substantial federation of the World Scouts with the original movement. American boys are the ones to say that the Boy Scout ideal is not half large enough or half progressive enough to suit them.

Commerce is teaching men so much about their fellow men, and setting up so many close international relations that war is getting hard to start. The one permanent spiritual force in socialism, too, is its valuable byproduct of international fellowship and brotherhood.

Other less powerful factors come in besides, and the sum total of pacific interests nowadays makes a nation think carefully and count closely before she goes to war.

Now, turn loose half a million American boys to scout the world in search of real chivalrous adventure,—imbued with the idea that the only way to abolish murder is to stop killing people, that the only way to promote friendship is to be friendly,—and war would never have a second chance.

Those same boys would grow up to see the world's navies on the scrap heap, and its standing armies back at the woodpile and the furrow, doing something useful.

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE RIGHT AND WRONG

of the

MONROE DOCTRINE

BY

CHARLES F. DOLE

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

April, 1912, No. 5, Part V

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

BY CHARLES F. DOLE.

Among the magical words that hypnotize men's minds and keep them from asking intelligent questions, the Monroe Doctrine has a sovereign charm in American politics. Secretary Hay has coupled the mention of this Doctrine with the Golden Rule. Let us venture to ask a few straight questions, and not be afraid to go wherever the honest answer to our questions may carry us.

First, what was the substance of the original Monroe Doctrine in 1823, when it was promulgated? The Spanish-American colonies had then revolted, and we had recognized their independence. There was a boundary question between the United States and Russia. We were a young republic, trying a great experiment in the eyes of a critical and unfriendly world. A "Holy Alliance," organized at the instance of Russia, with a really beautiful program for the good order of Europe, threatened to be turned into an instrument of mischief and oppression and even to help Spain recover her possessions in America. It is likely that, as in many other instances of human alarm, nothing dangerous would have happened. But our government naturally felt nervous, and raised its cry of warning in the form of the Monroe Doctrine. This was merely a declaration, made by the President in his message to Congress, to the effect that the United States would hold it unfriendly in the European powers to take any aggressive action in this continent. Important as the subject now seems, it involved no vote in Congress, nor the careful discussion that an actual vote generally involves. It is doubtful whether many Americans who read Monroe's message gave serious thought to the passages which were destined to give his name prominence. But Americans would have generally agreed in their disinclination to see monarchies set up in the New World, or to suffer any kind of undemocratic system to be brought over here from Europe.

It is noteworthy that the bare statement of the attitude of the United States, without any show of force or preparation for war, was sufficient to secure respectful treatment from the European powers. President Monroe did not feel called upon to ask appropriations for an increase in the navy in

order to "back up" his doctrine. The United States did not possess a formidable navy till it had to build one in the period of the Civil War.

It should also be remarked that England, doubtless for commercial reasons, forwarded our government in its attitude in behalf of the independence of the South American republics. Few would have dreamed at that time that the Monroe Doctrine would ever be used as a menace against England.

See now what enormous political changes have come about within eighty years. Except Russia, there is not an autocratic government left of all the nations who composed the short-lived Holy Alliance. All the others, even Austria and Spain, have adopted constitutional methods. Their people have everywhere been given more or less democratic representation. Spain does not contemplate winning back her colonies. We possess by amicable purchase the very territory over which there was once risk of a boundary dispute with Russia. So far from fearing the extension of autocratic and oppressive governments from Europe to America, the European governments are daily brought to face new demands on the part of their people in the direction of democratic experiments. Autocratic militarism all over the world stands on the defensive. It is becoming recognized as economically and politically intolerable. A great international court has been established on purpose to put an end to war between the nations. It has begun to be used and respected.

Meanwhile the world has become one in geography and international relations. We are practically nearer to the shores of Europe than we are to South America. We have larger and closer interests with China and Japan than we have with Chile and Guatemala.

Let us try now to find what European power, if any, threatens to bring the methods of oppression and tyranny to our continent, or in any way to menace the welfare of the United States. Russia, as we have observed, is out of the question, having voluntarily withdrawn from this continent. She allowed her proud flag to be hauled down in Alaska without the slightest loss of honor.

England is our best friend in all the world. Let us never admit jealousy or suspicion between us. For three thousand miles our territory and the Dominion of Canada march together. By mutual consent neither of us has a ship of war upon the Great Lakes. Let us see to it that we never put warships there. We are obviously safer without them. Like two strong men, dwelling on adjacent farms, we are mutually safeguarded, not by building suspicious fences against each other and purchasing weapons in view of the possibility of our wishing to fight, but rather by assuming that we shall never be so foolish as to injure each other. If we ever disagree, we do not purpose to degrade ourselves by fighting. So far as England is concerned, we may venture boldly to declare that the United States does not need a fort nor a battleship. We contemplate her time-honored naval station at Halifax

as complacently as travelers view the collection of ancient armor in the Tower of London. Moreover, as regards the Monroe Doctrine, the last thing which England could possibly attempt, with her own popular constitution, would be to abridge the liberties of Americans, either North or South.

Summon now the Republic of France, and interrogate her as to her designs and ambitions touching the affairs of America. Probably few Americans could name her *cis-Atlantic* possessions, so inconspicuous are they. They are costing the French treasury a steady outgo. No intelligent nation would take the gift of them, especially of Martinique, with its tempestuous volcanoes. France has had little experience with American colonies cheerful enough to stir her to desire the risk of a disagreement with the United States for the sake of gaining more territory. Nevertheless, we must admit that we had rather live under the rule of France than in most of the states of South or Central America. From no point of view does France threaten to establish a tyranny over any of the populations in the New World.

We hear of Italians in South America. They have emigrated to the Argentine Republic. Does this fact make the slightest demand upon the United States to build iron ships to guard against the friendly government of Victor Emmanuel? On the contrary, the more Italians in the Argentine Republic, the better we like it. They are more enterprising and industrious than either the Spaniards or the natives, and there is plenty of room for all who wish to go there. Is it conceivable that Italy, saddled with ruinous debt and with a fearful burden of European militarism, should undertake a war of conquest in South America? If this were conceivable, does any one suppose that Italian rule down there, supposing it to prevail, would be less enlightened, or less righteous, than Spanish-American rule has been under the delusive name of "republic"? The people of the United States cannot know Italy, or her political conditions, and feel the slightest apprehension that she is capable of extending to our continent methods of government inimical to our peace.

No other nation in Europe remains, about whose designs in our continent the American people have the need to lose a wink of sleep, except Germany. If the plain truth were told by the alarmists, Germany is very nearly the one power in Christendom on whose account we are called upon to pay a naval "insurance fund" of a hundred millions of dollars a year. The talk about a "German peril" would be laughable, if millions of poor people did not need the money which such incendiary talk costs us; or, worse yet, if this ceaseless talk about possible war with a great nation were not irritating to every one concerned, and naturally provocative of ill feeling.

—Why, indeed, should we imagine mischief from Germany? To hear certain speakers and writers, one would suppose that Germany—instead of being a land of arts and laws, of universities and free institutions, with a vast network of world-wide trade—was overrun, as of old, by barbarous

hordes breathing violence and robbery. Germany, in fact, has no quarrel or enmity against the kindred people of the United States. Germany is richer every day by reason of the prosperity of our country. The export and import trade between the United States and Germany amounted in 1911 to over four hundred and fifty millions of dollars. The trade with all the countries of South and Central America for the same year was only about three hundred and ten millions. The trade with all Asia, including India and the British dependencies, was hardly three hundred millions. The boasted "open door" into the Chinese Empire only allowed the passage both ways of about fifty-four millions of dollars' worth of products,—less than one-eighth of our trade with Germany.* Does any one think that Germany would lightly quarrel with the source of so much bread and butter? For what possible use? She could not conquer and enslave us, nor does she wish to. We have no boundary lines on the planet to make friction between us. We may say again stoutly, as in the case of England, we are safer from any possible attack from Germany without a ship or a fort than we are with the largest navy that Admiral Mahan could desire. For in the one case we should be sure to avoid needless disputes, and should be more than willing on both sides to put any question that might ever arise between us to arbitration: whereas in the other case, standing with loaded guns as it were, some trifling explosion of an angry man's temper might involve the two nations in strife.

It may be asked whether there is not grave risk that Germany may endeavor to plant colonies in South America or to interfere in some way with the affairs of the South American people. We hardly need more than to repeat the paragraph touching this kind of contingency on the part of Italy. Germans are doubtless coming in considerable numbers into the temperate countries of South America. They are a most desirable kind of immigrant. Wherever they go, a higher civilization goes with them. Life and property are safer. A more efficient type of government is demanded. All this is surely for the interest of the United States. We can only be glad for any influences which will tone up the character of the South and Central American states. If they were all Germanized, the whole world, including the United States, would be permanently richer. In fact, the ties of trade and friendship between us and a possible Germanized state in South America would normally tend to be closer than they seem likely to be with the Spanish-American peoples.

Neither is there the slightest evidence that Germany would ever threaten to introduce tyrannical forms of government into South America or to oppress the native peoples. Indeed, so far as it is good for the United States to govern the Philippine Islands for the betterment of their people, the same argument holds in favor of any reasonable method (for example,

*The value of the total trade to and from the Philippine Islands in the same year (about thirty-seven millions) could not possibly have covered the military and naval cost of holding the Islands.

through purchase or by the final consent of the people) for the extension of German law and political institutions into ill-governed South American states. I do not care to press this argument, which is only valid for those Americans who believe in our colonial experiment. But the argument is far stronger for possible German colonies than it is for the United States, inasmuch as South America is a natural and legitimate field for German immigration, being largely a wilderness, while no large number of Americans will ever care to settle in the Philippine Islands. The time may naturally come when Germany would have the same kind of interest in the welfare of her people beyond the seas that England has in that of the Englishmen in South Africa. There can be no good reason why the United States should look upon such an interest with jealousy or suspicion. For we are unlikely to have any legitimate colonial interest in the southern half of our continent.

Meanwhile, the whole history of colonial settlements goes to show the futility of holding colonies with which the home government is not bound by the ties of good-will. Thus Canada and Australia uphold the British Empire, because they possess practical freedom; while England has to spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year, badly needed by her own poor people, to maintain the armaments necessary to keep her hold over India and other dependencies reluctant to her rule. All precedents go to show that the Empire of Germany would only weaken herself in case she should endeavor to meddle in South America against the interests and the good-will of the people there.

Let us ask another question, hitherto too little considered. On what ground of right is the United States justified in continuing to assert the Monroe Doctrine? We may warn trespassers off our own land. Have we the right to bar our neighbors from lands to which we have no shadow of a title? Suppose that we may do this, as the stronger people, for the sake of humanity, to protect weaker people from oppression. It is surely a dangerous concession to permit a single state, however civilized it deems itself, to assume the right to become a knight-errant, to adjust wrongs in the world, and incidentally to be sheriff, judge and jury on its own motion. But grant this concession for a moment in favor of the United States. While it may have been true eighty years ago that the American people were filled with sympathy for the republics which revolted from Spain, it would be hypocrisy to claim to-day that our people are seriously concerned over the troubles of their South American neighbors. We are rather apt to say that they are unfit to govern themselves. The United States to-day holds eight millions of people on the other side of the globe, very like the South Americans, on the distinct ground that they are not yet fit for independence. Our own course, therefore, bars us from sensitiveness over the perils which South America suffers from the bare possibility of the interference of European states.

Moreover, we have shown that there is no state in Europe which has a mind to do any wrong to South America. So far as the promise of higher civilization goes, the planting of *bona fide* colonies in the vast areas of our southern continent signifies good to humanity.

We must fall back upon a totally different line of reasoning in order to find the only legitimate defense of our Monroe Doctrine. The argument is this: that a nation has the right to safeguard herself against the menace of aggression. Concede that this might have been a sound argument when the Monroe Doctrine was first proclaimed. Our government saw a peril in the setting up of a European system of despotism on this continent. We have made it clear, however, that this peril which disturbed our fathers appears to have vanished forever. No one can show what actual danger to our liberties is threatened by any governmental system that European powers can set up in South America. Let us not even imagine that we are in fear of such a chimerical peril. We have no fear that Germany wishes to harm us while she stays at home in Europe. We have no more ground for fear, if Germany were by some magic to fill South America as full of sturdy German people as Canada is now full of friendly English, Scotch and Frenchmen. The better civilized our neighbors are, the less peril do they threaten to our liberties. Let us then disabuse our minds of any fear of European aggression, to injure American liberties.

But it may be urged that the European governments, as was shown in the Venezuelan episode, may prove disagreeable in their efforts to collect debts due to their subjects or, on occasion, in safeguarding the rights of their colonists in the disorderly South American states. The condition of these states, it is urged, offers points of serious friction between us and our European neighbors. The class of issues here raised stands quite aside from the original intent of the Monroe Doctrine. Here is the need of new international law, of the services of the Hague Tribunal, very likely of the establishment of a permanent Congress of Nations. How far ought any nation to undertake by warships and armies to collect debts for venturesome subjects who have speculated in the tumultuous politics of semi-civilized peoples? How far is the real welfare of the world served by punitive expeditions dispatched in the name of missionaries, travelers, and traders, who have chosen to take their own lives in their hands in the wild regions of the world? There is no call for a Monroe Doctrine on these points. The issue is international, not American. The question is not so much whether France and England may send a fleet to take the customs duties of a dilapidated South American port as it is what course ought any government to take when wily promoters ask its assistance in carrying out their schemes in Bogota or Caracas or Peking; or, again (an equally pertinent question), what remedy, if any, international law ought to give when one of our own cities or states defaults its bonds held in Paris or Berlin.

Grant that it would be uncomfortable to our traders in South America to see European sheriffs holding ports where we wish to do business. We evidently have no right to protest against other nations doing whatever we might do in like circumstances. If we can send armored ships to South America, all the others can do so. If we like to keep the perilous right to collect debts, we must concede it to the others. We may not like to see strangers, or even our own neighbors, taking liberties and quarreling in the next field to our own. But who gives us the right forcibly to drive them out of a field which we do not own? The rule here seems to be the same for the nation as for the individual.

Meanwhile there is one simple proposition the adoption of which could do nothing but good. The Drago Doctrine, associated with the name of an eminent Argentine statesman, is in line with the general trend of civilization and with our own national spirit. A mild and tentative approach to it was made at the Second Hague Conference, under the lead of General Porter, one of our delegates. So far, however, the agreement only looks to the use of an obligation to arbitrate claims for debts, but leaves open the menace of possible war. What we need is a new and complete formulation of the idea of the Drago Doctrine, in such terms that no nation should be permitted under any circumstances to go to war to collect her subjects' debts. It ought to be made infamous to kill innocent people merely because of a quarrel over the payment of debts, presumably incurred under dubious political conditions.

The fact is, whatever the Monroe Doctrine historically means, it no longer requires us to stand guard against any nation in Europe, with a show of force to maintain it. In its most critical form, when it meant a warning against despotism, it only needed to be proclaimed, and never to be defended by fighting ships. In the face of governments practically like our own, the time has come to inquire whether there remains any reasonable issue under the name of the Monroe Doctrine, over which the American people could have the least justification for a conflict of arms with a European government. The interests of the United States in South America are not different from those of other powers, like England and Germany. They are substantially identical interests; they are all obviously involved together with the improvement of material, political and moral conditions in the South American states.

We have spoken so far as if the Monroe Doctrine had reference only to our relations with European nations. The last thing that any one dreamed of in the days of President Monroe was that the doctrine would ever be brought to bear against an Asiatic power! Japan is the one power which seems to cause certain nervous statesmen and builders of battleships a spasm of anxiety. What if Japan should establish a colony on our continent? Having reached our own hands into Asiatic waters to seize territory against the will of its inhabitants, we are now asked to contemplate

the possibility that Japan likewise might reach many thousands of miles after American territory. Calmly considered, however, this seems to be a purely gratuitous cause of apprehension. Those who know Japan best assure us that she harbors no hostile intention against the United States. She is certainly much occupied with costly enterprises at home and in Korea and Manchuria. She has growingly valuable trade relations with us, which tend always to make peace. The worst source of mischief in sight between Japan and us is really what we are doing ourselves by way of making a Gibraltar in Hawaii. What is this but to show fear and suspicion, which in turn excite the like uncivilized passions? Let us even suppose that Japan desired to establish a colony in Mexico or some other state in America. How could she possibly do this, except by the goodwill and agreement of the people by whose side she settled? Does any one imagine that her experience in Formosa has been so cheap and easy as to lead her to seek a hornets' nest on the opposite side of the Pacific Ocean into which to put her hands! But suppose the most unlikely thing, that Mexico or Chile wished the Japanese colony. Can any one show what shadow of right the United States would have to forbid this?

We have sought so far such an interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine as may honorably go in company of the Golden Rule, or, in other words, of international justice. There remains, however, a possible new definition of the doctrine, which should be fairly faced. There is an idea in the air that the United States holds a certain protectorate or suzerainty over the whole continent of America. A manifest destiny is thought to be working in favor of the dominion or suzerainty of a single power from the Arctic Ocean to Patagonia. Porto Rico is ours. Cuba is almost ours. Many believe that Canada will some time desire to be with us. No people to the south of us shows stable promise of what we call good government. The new canal at Panama affords additional reasons for our control of the continent. Boundless resources are yet to be developed in the virgin continent. We are the people who can provide the brains, the capital and the political security requisite for the exploitation of practically a seventh of the surface of the earth.

The new Monroe Doctrine comes thus to mean, frankly, that we want, or at least may some time want, all America for ourselves. We give due notice in advance of our claim of pre-emption. What else does the Monroe Doctrine mean, that there should be the pretense of a necessity to fight for it? What else did President Roosevelt mean by his note of repeated warning to the republics of South and Central America that they must "behave themselves"? Here and nowhere else looms up the need of new battleships and a hundred millions of dollars a year for the navy. It is in regard to South America, and for the extension of the Monroe Doctrine to a control over the continent, that we discover in the political

horizon all manner of colossal foreign responsibilities and the possibilities of friction and war.

The new Monroe Doctrine may kindle the imagination and stir the ambition of thoughtless people; it may tempt some of them with a glamour of power and wealth. We may fancy that we would like to be the suzerain power on the continent, with United States officials in authority in every Spanish and Portuguese American capital. The stern ancient question presses: What right has the United States to assume a protectorate, and much less any form of sovereignty, over South America? The South American governments are as independent as our own; they are growing more stable and less revolutionary every year. There are no traditions common between us to constitute us an acknowledged Lord Protector over them. On the contrary, our conduct toward Colombia and the Philippines, and the extraordinary utterances of some of our public men seem to have already produced a certain nervousness among our Spanish-American neighbors who naturally resent our patronage.

Neither does international law, which has never in the past given the Monroe Doctrine any clearly acknowledged footing, admit the right of the United States to mark off the American continent as its own preserve, and to stand, like a dog in the manger, to warn other friendly peoples from entering it.

But some philanthropic banker may ask: "May we not be good and kind to the States to the south of us? Is it not praiseworthy to install at least an honest fiscal service, supported, of course, if need be, by gunboats, in Honduras and other states, as we have done in Santo Domingo?" Let us not shut our eyes to the seamy side of this enterprise. Would anything persuade us to give our ports and custom-houses into the control of an alien power, however benevolent? Who can show where fiscal control can be hindered from passing subtly over into an actual Protectorate? The story of England in Egypt is the warning answer to this question. Surely, a government of the people, by the people and for the people was never meant to become the machinery for managing other people's affairs in the interest of their creditors. Or, if this ought to be so, it ought to be clearly voted accordingly by the American people after ample discussion, and not foisted upon us, almost without debate in Congress or elsewhere, by the will of the Executive. History shows that it is in such ways as this that the most revolutionary political changes have often been brought about.

It is certain that the millions of the plain American people, who toil and pay the taxes to the tune of about forty dollars a year for every average family, have no valid interests whatever in spending the money or the administrative ability of the country in dubious enterprises beyond the seas, at the behest of ambitious capitalists or politicians, who aim to open markets and run satrapies by the use of national battleships. The people,

who need indefinite services for the expansion of their welfare and happiness at home will never deliberately approve a policy which threatens to dissipate the activities of their government over the length of the continent. The new Monroe Doctrine is a menace to the interests of every American workingman. It is the old story. The few usurp the power of the many to work their own ends.

In short, so far as we are good friends of the South American peoples, so far as we are friends of our own kinsmen over the seas on the continent of Europe, so far as we desire permanent amicable relations with the people of Japan, so far as our intentions in South America are honestly humane and philanthropic, we have no need whatever of the Monroe Doctrine any longer. On the side of our common humanity all our interests are substantially identical. On the other hand, so far as we purpose to exploit the continent for our own selfish interests, so far as we aim at the extension of our power, so far as we purpose to force our forms of civilization and our government upon peoples whom we deem our "inferiors," our new Monroe Doctrine rests upon no grounds of justice or right, it has no place with the Golden Rule, it is not synonymous with human freedom: it depends upon might, and it doubtless tends to provoke jealousy, if not hostility and war.

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

July, 1912, No. 6, Part I

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

If a thousandth part of what has been expended in war and preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries past of its terrors, its sufferings, its impoverishment and its demoralization, but what was learned from history.—HORACE MANN.

*Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.—LONGFELLOW.*

Foreword

In sending out this brief report of the present activities of the World Peace Foundation, a summary purposely so brief that, it is hoped, it will be carefully read by all into whose hands it comes, I wish to ask the serious attention of all friends of the peace cause to the important interests which the Foundation is serving, and to the magnitude of the evils with which we have to cope. The nations have been for centuries learning the art of war and perfecting the present military machinery and organization. The monstrous armaments have become an intolerable burden, taxing the resources of the world to a degree that threatens universal bankruptcy; yet the false fears and rivalries of governments, the ambitions of the military class and the vested interests which thrive upon the present system all work powerfully together for its continuance and growth. The clear logic of the situation prescribes that the machinery for the settling of international differences by force should steadily decrease with the increase of the machinery for their settlement by law. The development of these judicial instrumentalities in recent years has been rapid and very great, yet the great armaments, instead of being steadily reduced as they clearly should have been, have steadily grown greater still. The waste and folly of this course have been repeatedly pointed out. It is easy to show, as Cobden showed fifty years ago, that the ratio of five to five is just the same as that of ten to ten, and that the mad naval rivalries should be checked by the mutual agreement of governments; and to show that every principle of political economy and good business, as well as of justice and humanity, is violated by the present course. Yet the governments and the peoples do not heed the lesson, and they will not do it until education in the true principles of international order has become pervasive and controlling. It is to this patient and thorough work of education, through the school, the college, the church, the press, the pamphlet and the book, that the World Peace Foundation addresses itself. It coöperates cordially with every other agency; but, as the reader of these pages will see, the demands of its own special work and of imperative duties waiting to be done are already far beyond its present resources. I ask the attention of generous friends of the cause to the various urgent needs here presented.

I am glad indeed to make my own personal contribution of \$50,000 a year to the work, but I ask that others who are able will make similar contributions. I ask especially, since I believe that the strength of any such great educational work lies not in its maintenance by half a dozen philanthropists, but by a great body of devoted friends, each doing what he can, that hundreds and thousands of our people should unite in the work. I should like to see hundreds and thousands of centers of activity for the promotion of the interests which the Foundation has at heart established throughout the country and throughout the world. Glad as we are to furnish lecturers for meetings of many kinds devoted to the movement, I ask that our friends everywhere should coöperate to make such meetings self-supporting and to secure for them the largest measure of success. Glad as we are to send our pamphlets to all, I ask that our friends everywhere should do what they can toward the expenses of their circulation and toward the widest spread of the books published by the Foundation. It is only by the united endeavor and the united generosity and sacrifice of thousands that the great work which we are called upon to do can be adequately and successfully done.

EDWIN GINN.

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES

The World Peace Foundation, founded by Edwin Ginn, was permanently organized in July, 1910, and incorporated later in the same year. The trustees of the Foundation are Edwin Ginn, President Lowell of Harvard University, President Faunce of Brown University, President Swain of Swarthmore College, Professor Samuel T. Dutton of Columbia University, Miss Sarah Louise Arnold, dean of Simmons College, Rev. Edward Cummings, Hon. Samuel W. McCall, George A. Plimpton of New York, George W. Anderson, Samuel B. Capen and Albert E. Pillsbury of Boston. The directors are Dr. David Starr Jordan, Edwin D. Mead, James Brown Scott, Rev. Charles R. Brown, James A. Macdonald, John R. Mott and Hamilton Holt. The treasurer is Richard H. Dana.

While thus completely organized only two years ago, the World Peace Foundation, under its original name of the International School of Peace, had been gradually shaping itself and doing ever more and more important work for nearly ten years. Mr. Ginn's interest in the peace cause dates from a time much farther back than ten years ago. Like many others of us, he was profoundly affected by Dr. Hale and his devotion to international justice. One conference at least of influential Boston workers for the cause, at which Dr. Hale presided, was held in Mr. Ginn's office long before the International School of Peace had been definitely mentioned. Mr. Ginn was at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, that inspiring nursery of so much of potency in the peace cause in America, as early as 1897. He was there again in 1899, and again in 1901, and in this latter year made his first speech there. He emphasized the special duty of business men and the importance of more generous financial provision for the cause. "We spend hundreds of millions for war: can we not afford," he asked, "to spend one million for peace?" That was his key-note. He was presently saying, and this he long continued to say, that he would be one of ten to give a million. But he grew weary in waiting for response, and decided that he would make his own contribution unconditionally and begin, letting his \$50,000 a year go as far as it would, confident that others would help in good time. He announced this publicly in a letter to the *Nation*, published

September 23, 1909; and on December 15, 1909, the headquarters for the new International School of Peace were opened at 29A Beacon Street, with a meeting on the evening of that day attended by a large number of leading peace workers of Boston and the vicinity, at which addresses were made by representatives of various peace organizations. This was a distinct step in the larger work; although the varied work of the preceding years, preliminary to the broader plans, had been well considered, significant, and very necessary work. The writer had been Mr. Ginn's adviser and helper in developing his plans since 1901; and from that time onward Mr. Ginn had been giving liberally for the peace cause, his contributions in the years immediately preceding his final settlement of \$50,000 a year upon the work having been \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year. It was at the International Peace Congress in Boston in 1904 that he first publicly outlined his plans in a general way, doing the same at the International Congress at Lucerne the next year, and at the National Congresses in New York and Chicago in 1907 and 1909, the last briefly before his endowment of the School of Peace. His message at these Congresses was a simple and an urgent one, and always essentially the same,—that the peace movement must be better organized and better financed. At the time of the incorporation of the Foundation in 1910, he made definite legal provision of \$50,000 a year for the work during his lifetime; and his will provides for an equal annual income perpetually. This generous provision was made considerably before the announcement of the great Carnegie Peace Endowment of \$10,000,000, which has given such encouragement and joy to the world's peace workers, and was the largest contribution which had then ever been made for educational work for peace.

The practical beginning was the publication of peace books, the starting of the International Library, in 1902. As a lifelong educational publisher, Mr. Ginn appreciates peculiarly the value of the wide circulation of the best books in the interest of any great educational movement; and he saw that the peace movement sadly lacked books. He determined that it should be supplied with all the books and pamphlets that it needs. There is, of course, a splendid and rapidly growing body of peace literature in the world, but comparatively little of it was accessible in cheap and tasteful form. So the first three volumes of the International Library were published in 1902,—Bloch's "The Future of War" and the famous addresses of Channing and Sumner. The dimensions to which the Library has already grown appear from the list printed elsewhere in the present pamphlet. It is proper to say that no other equally important series of peace works

has ever before been undertaken. Parallel with the issue of these books has been the pamphlet service. The list of the pamphlets already issued, circulated often to the number of 25,000 or more, will also be found on another page.

The income of the Foundation last year, 1911, was about a thousand dollars in excess of the \$50,000 annually contributed by Mr. Ginn. The expenditures for the year left a surplus of about \$9,000 to be carried forward to 1912, but this surplus has been substantially all taken up through the assumption by the Foundation itself of the direct publication of the International Library, the volumes in which had been previously printed and published for the Foundation by Ginn and Company. During 1911 three important new books were added to the International Library,—Reinsch's "Public International Unions," Bridgman's "First Book of World Law," and the volume of Proceedings of the Universal Races Congress at London; and there has since been issued the important volume giving the full text of Senator Root's argument in the Newfoundland Fisheries Arbitration, edited with an historical introduction by James Brown Scott. This is a work of unusual significance. In his now famous address at Washington, on December 17, 1910, before the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, in which he made his great plea for the arbitration of all international differences which could not be settled by regular diplomatic negotiation, President Taft said: "What teaches nations and peoples the possibility of permanent peace is the actual settlement of controversies by courts of arbitration. The settlement of the Alabama controversy by the Geneva Tribunal, the settlement of the Seals controversy by the Paris Tribunal, and the settlement of the Newfoundland Fisheries controversy by the Hague Tribunal are three great substantial steps toward permanent peace, three facts accomplished that have done more for the cause than anything else in history." It is singularly fortunate that at this particular time, when the minds of the American and English peoples are focused upon the subject of international arbitration as never before, we should be given the present volume, in which the last of the three great arbitrations so conspicuously referred to by President Taft is presented, in its history and in the argument of Mr. Root, the leading American counsel in the case, with a completeness unexampled, as concerns provision for the general public, in the annals of great arbitration cases. Many new pamphlets, leaflets and broadsides were added last year, with new editions of former issues in the pamphlet series, and of these various papers about 300,000 copies were circulated. The Foundation aims

to meet by its multiplied pamphlets the needs of all peace workers for the most timely and effective material for the varying exigencies of the movement, and it asks special attention to the latest issues of the series.

During the year Dr. Jordan gave a hundred addresses or more in behalf of the cause before university students, educational conventions, and gatherings of many kinds. Although his addresses, aside from those in Japan, have been in places as widely scattered as Denver, Milwaukee, Chicago, Buffalo, Boston, New York and Washington, a specially large number have been given in California, where vigorous work in behalf of inter-racial good understanding and good-will is always imperative on account of the prejudices against the Chinese and Japanese appearing periodically, with complications sometimes grave and mischievous. An earnest friend of the cause in California has just given the Foundation \$500 for work especially in that region, and it were to be wished that a hundred friends would do the same, either as concerns that field or others. The National Education Association held its annual convention in San Francisco last July, and in connection with it there were no meetings more important than those in the interest of the American School Peace League, whose work has been indorsed by the Association and in a certain measure affiliated with it. Dr. Jordan took a particularly influential part in the San Francisco meetings of the League, and accepted the presidency of its California branch, which was organized at the time. In connection with Professor Krehbiel of Stanford University, Dr. Jordan gave during the last year, and is repeating the same the present year, an extended course of lectures upon the history and character of the movement for international arbitration; and this course, which involves much study and research on the part of the students, proved exceedingly popular and was largely attended. A thorough syllabus was prepared to accompany it, so detailed as to make a considerable volume, and this syllabus, carefully revised, is now being printed, and will soon be generally available, published by the Peace Foundation, and of great service to professors and students in other universities where similar work may be undertaken.

But Dr. Jordan rendered no other service during the year so important as that in connection with his visit to Japan and Korea. He sailed early in August, and arrived home late in October. On the way out he addressed a great mass meeting at Honolulu, and distinctly strengthened the peace movement there. He spent seven weeks in Japan and Korea, making in all sixty-four addresses, assisting in the organization of branches of the Japan Peace Society at

Asaka, Nagoya, Kobe and Okayama, as well as speaking at meetings under the direction of societies already existing in Tokyo and Kyoto. He came into close touch with large numbers of the statesmen and scholars of Japan, was received everywhere with the greatest warmth, profiting peculiarly from the co-operation of the many Japanese graduates of Stanford University now filling responsible places in Japan, and altogether accomplishing a noteworthy work in the promotion of Japanese and American friendship. The results of this work have been reported in many newspapers and before many audiences; and of conspicuous service was the address given by Dr. Jordan before the important conference at Clark University in Worcester in November upon the relations of Japan and the United States. This Worcester Conference, altogether, was of the highest significance in the advancement of the interests of the international good understanding which the World Peace Foundation, in common with all other peace agencies, has at heart. President Hall and Professor Blakeslee cannot be too warmly thanked for the signal work they are doing in this field, and all workers for international justice and inter-racial sympathy should follow regularly the records of this notable work in the pages of the *Journal of Race Development*, published by Clark University. During his whole stay in Japan, as well as in his many addresses since his return, Dr. Jordan has neglected no opportunity to stamp out the unintelligence, misrepresentation and mischief-making which are so prevalent as concerns the relation of Japan and the United States; and to these things he particularly addressed himself in an interview published in the Japanese newspapers as he came away. He said at the close of this interview:

"The currents of world life flow through Japan, and Japan's response to truth and justice is not unlike that of the other great nations. I do not find in Japan any of the spirit of war for war's sake, which has been the bane of European politics, nor any desire on the part of people wise and well informed for international aggression of any sort. While one may hear opinions of almost any kind, if he looks for them, I find the average public opinion in Japan on the question of friendly relations among nations quite as sane and rational as in any other nation whatever."

At the very time of President Jordan's visit to Japan, Mr. Hamilton Holt, managing editor of the *Independent*, also one of the directors of the World Peace Foundation, was in Japan, going there for a brief visit with Mr. Lindsey Russell, president of the New York Japan Society. They were everywhere most warmly received; and what Mr. Holt wrote and said, both during his stay in Japan and after

his return, was of high value in the promotion of intelligent mutual understanding on the part of the two peoples. The dinner of welcome given to Mr. Holt and Mr. Russell at Tokyo, September 25, was the occasion of a remarkable address by Prince Tokugawa, president of the Japanese House of Peers, who presided, in which the duty of the maintenance of right relations between Japan and America was strikingly emphasized. "Nobody who really knows the American people," said Prince Tokugawa, "can ever doubt that their sentiments are thoroughly friendly to us. As for ourselves, we all know that we are in no less degree friendly to the Americans." But he proceeded to point out the mischief worked by certain Americans "who make it their business to start now and then an anti-Japanese campaign through the press and on the platform." He was quite aware that the real purpose of much of this agitation was to further schemes of military and naval increase; but he urged all lovers of peace and good-will between the two peoples never to forget the bodies of ignorant people in all countries who are easily misled by these sensations. It was important that men of influence and power in America should steadily enlighten their fellow-countrymen as to real conditions. Prince Tokugawa's speech is printed at the end of the address upon "The Truth about Japan," by Dr. John H. DeForest, recently printed in one of the World Peace Foundation's pamphlets, and should be carefully read by all who are interested in our relations with Japan. This word of the Japanese statesman is a true attestation of the importance of such service as that which Dr. Jordan and Mr. Holt have rendered, and of the constant need of such service. Messengers of good-will, reporters of the truth, men of the highest character and credentials, should constantly be passing from one country to the other; and it was a peculiar satisfaction to know that President Eliot, under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment, was leaving upon his peace mission in China and Japan just as Dr. Jordan and Mr. Holt were returning.

The needs and the opportunities for such work by American peace leaders in China are, if possible, greater even than in Japan. China contains a quarter of the world's population; and the political and social transformations in China at this hour form perhaps the most impressive and pregnant chapter in recent history. The progress of the Chinese people during the next half-century is likely to be as rapid and portentous as that of the Japanese people in the last half-century; and the service of the American people in connection with it may be as great. The present revolution has been peculiarly a scholars' revolution; and a great contingent of this body of scholars

is made up of men trained in American schools or affected by American influence. The leader of the revolution has defined his purpose as the creation in China of a federal republic like the republic of the United States. The services of American teachers in both China and Japan have been most significant. Many American missionaries in both countries, men like Martin, Smith, Tenney and DeForest, have been real statesmen; and their services for the cause of good understanding and good-will have been signal indeed. The zealous and persistent work of Mr. John R. Mott, the director of the international department of the Young Men's Christian Associations, also one of the directors of the World Peace Foundation, has been notable, not only in Japan and China, but in Turkey and elsewhere, and it has been inspired by profound appreciation of the peculiar obligations and opportunities of the West in advancing the cause of human brotherhood and co-operation in the Orient. The services of many English workers in China have been equally beneficent with those of American teachers; and especial attention should be directed to the remarkable work of the Society for Promoting Christian and General Knowledge, at Shanghai, of which Sir Robert Hart was long the president, and of which Dr. Timothy Richard has been for so many years the secretary and real director. A chief part of the work of this society has been the translation and wide circulation in China of books communicating Western thought to the Chinese people in impressive and popular form. More than 200 volumes—history, politics, science, romance, travel, education—have thus been given broad and influential currency throughout China, with incalculable results upon the national life and thought. An illustration is the translation of Mackenzie's little *History of the Nineteenth Century*. This Chinese translation was read by one of the Chinese viceroys. He was so deeply stirred by it that he personally sent copies to all of the other viceroys in the empire, begging them to read the book, and saying that a civilization which could make such progress in a century as that recorded between the first and last pages of this little book was a civilization which Chinese students could not afford to neglect. The whole influence of this noble institution has been in behalf of progressive ideas and of international sentiment in China; and few living statesmen—for a real and prophetic statesman he is—have rendered greater international service than Dr. Timothy Richard. During his visit to the United States a dozen years ago he met many of our own international workers. Mr. and Mrs. Mead met him again in London in 1905, and he accompanied them to the International Peace Congress at Lucerne, where he also met Mr.

Ginn; and he is always in touch with the World Peace Foundation. Through the agency of his society an immense service could be done in the mediation of the best international literature and thought to the people of China at this critical juncture in their history; and this is but one illustration of the unlimited opportunities there offered for service in a period which will largely determine the character of the future of China. The great new republic is peculiarly hospitable to American co-operation. Such missions as those of Dr. Jordan and Mr. Holt last year to Japan should be multiplied in China; and vastly more systematic and consecutive international work should be done there through the regular co-operation of American and Chinese scholars. This commanding need is earnestly commended to the attention of every thoughtful reader of these pages. The World Peace Foundation could apply to work in China alone, in this great hour, a larger amount annually than its present total resources. Is there not some generous American who will make this work possible? The founder of the World Peace Foundation, whose name is in no way attached to the Foundation, and who desires to be but one of many supporters of its work, would welcome nothing so much as contributions to the work greater than his own, making the work to that extent more the work of others than of himself; and there is no field where some great gift to the Foundation could be made to count for more at this critical hour than the field of China.

A singularly favorable point for useful international influence, as concerns the United States and the Orient, is Hawaii. The Mid-Pacific Institute established there in recent years, for which nearly half a million has already been raised, is pervaded by a splendid international spirit, students of many races working together there in hearty co-operation. Mr. Theodore Richards, who has been active in its development, has this last winter visited Boston and come into close touch with the Foundation, which desires on its part to co-operate more actively with him and his friends in Hawaii. There are 80,000 Japanese on the islands, which, half-way between Japan and the United States, are a fortunate and strategic meeting-ground. Japanese statesmen and scholars are earnestly co-operating with Mr. Richards in the matter of scholarships which he is arranging for Japanese students in Hawaii; and the essays on international fraternity written in a competition by some of the Japanese students have been admirable. Mr. Richards pertinently asked, during his recent American visit, whether the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for educational work in Hawaii, inspired by true international sentiment, would not accomplish twenty times as much, for defence itself, as

the \$20,000,000 being spent to fortify Pearl Harbor, with sole reference to the Japanese, as they and we well know. The Foundation asks the American people to consider earnestly the claims of this international work in Hawaii, which can soon be made as important with reference to China as to Japan.

In behalf of the same effort in another field to bring the peace movement in America into closer co-operation with the movement in other countries, the writer spent last summer in Europe, chiefly in Great Britain and Germany. He attended the Universal Races Congress in London in July, giving the closing address of the Congress, upon "International Organization for Inter-racial Good Will," pointing out the methods by which the imperative work inaugurated by this great Congress could be continuously and efficiently carried on. The Proceedings of the Congress, including addresses by nearly sixty representatives of various peoples upon the most urgent inter-racial problems which the world faces, have been published by the World Peace Foundation, and should be widely read by our own people, who are themselves directly confronted by many of these problems. Mr. and Mrs. Mead spoke in Edinburgh, Dundee, Hull, Nottingham and Cambridge, as well as in London. At the Sunday afternoon peace meeting addressed by the writer at the Whitefield Chapel in London, more than a thousand men were present; and at many of the brotherhood meetings in England new prominence is being given to the peace cause. Both Mr. Brown and Mr. Macdonald addressed great peace meetings at Whitefield's last summer, Mr. Brown occupying the pulpit there during the whole of July. The month of August was spent by Mr. and Mrs. Mead in Germany, with several addresses in Berlin, with meetings also in Leipsic, Jena, and Stuttgart. As a result of their Leipsic meeting, a committee was formed to organize a Leipsic Peace Society, of which Professor Wilhelm Ostwald, who was present, expressed his willingness to become president. They took part in the meeting of the International Teachers' Association in Berlin, where it was voted that our own National Education Association be invited to affiliate itself with this great international organization, which has, like our American Association, identified itself emphatically with the peace movement. The writer came into touch with the American colony in Berlin through addresses both at the American church and before the American Association of Commerce; and a proposal made in his address at the American church, that an Andrew D. White Memorial building be erected in connection with the church, to promote the social and educational life of the American residents of Berlin, with an Im-

manuel Kant hall among its other rooms, the whole to be made a center for the promotion of German-American friendship, was received with special warmth by the German press as well as by the American public in Berlin. The Amerika Institut in Berlin is already doing a remarkable work for the university constituency; and the approach of the centennial of the entrance of the first group of American students into the German universities renders this a most fitting time for the building of such a German-American House for broader and more popular purposes as that here suggested for Berlin. The month in Germany was followed by large meetings in Vienna and Budapest and by a week at Berne in attendance upon the General Assembly of the International Peace Bureau. The visit to Budapest was of exceptional interest and marked by the warmest hospitality, prompted and led by Count Apponyi, who had given a series of peace addresses in the United States a few months before. Mr. and Mrs. Mead were made officially the guests of the Hungarian Group of the Interparliamentary Union during their visit to Budapest, were received at the Parliament House by the president of the Chamber of Deputies, and most cordially received at the banquet given them at the Hotel Hungaria; and at the large meeting which they addressed, and at which Count Apponyi presided, many members of the ministry and of Parliament were present. The whole visit to Budapest was an inspiring experience of the enthusiasm and progressive thought of the Hungarian people and the energetic international sentiment which has been fostered among them by Count Apponyi and his earnest associates.

At the meeting in Berne Mr. Ginn was also present, having already spent some weeks in Europe, meeting many of the leading peace workers. He represented America among the speakers at the festival with which the conference closed; and both he and the writer conferred fully with Senator LaFontaine, the Baroness von Suttner, Mr. Fried and other warm friends and helpers of the Foundation's interests in Europe. In England Mr. and Mrs. Mead's addresses were in many places arranged by Mr. Carl Heath, the secretary of the National Peace Council, whom the Foundation always counts as one of its best coworkers;* and there was profitable conference with Mr. Perris and other friends in London and with Baron d'Estournelles de Constant and others in Paris. Both in Berne and Paris there was much useful intercourse about the future of the work with Mr. Norman Angell Lane, whose penetrating and powerful book, "The Great Illusion," has rendered more signal service to the cause than

*The Foundation's publications can always be seen at the rooms of the National Peace Council in London.

any other book since Bloch's "Future of War"; and it is a pleasure to state that Mr. Lane's relations to the work of the Foundation will soon become regular and important. Few things have been done by the Foundation or by any peace agency during the year along lines more necessary or important than these efforts for closer co-operation with our fellow-workers in Europe and Japan. International work must be internationally done. The friends of peace in the different nations have worked too much, because little else has hitherto been possible, along national lines; but the time is ripe for representative workers in the different countries to get closer together, and to work together in more organic relations.

In Germany the movement for the establishment of International Clubs among the students of the universities was last summer found most hopefully started, owing its initiative to one of our young American scholars, Mr. George W. Nasmyth, of Cornell University, who two or three years ago was president of the American Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs. Mr. Nasmyth, after graduate work at Cornell, went to Berlin about two years ago to carry on his higher studies in physics. Filled with the splendid enthusiasm which marks the Cosmopolitan Club movement and finding 1,500 foreign students in the University of Berlin, he almost immediately set about organizing among them an International Club like the clubs with which he was so well acquainted at Cornell and other American universities. It proved from the start remarkably successful, quickly securing more than two hundred members, representing fifteen nations, and holding meetings of remarkable interest and value. When Mr. Nasmyth temporarily left Berlin in the spring of 1911, he was succeeded in the presidency of the club by an English student, and the present president is an Austrian. Last summer Mr. Nasmyth organized another club among the Leipsic students, in which Professor Lamprecht, the eminent historian, the rector of the university at the time, has co-operated most cordially. There is already good promise of similar organizations at Munich, Marburg, Göttingen, and other German universities; and the Swiss universities, more than one-half of whose students are foreigners, present unusual opportunities for this noteworthy students' movement. The possibilities of work in Germany are so great, and Mr. Nasmyth's qualifications for it are so rare, that the Foundation has arranged with him to devote his earnest attention to it for at least the next two years, in connection with his scientific work in Germany. He will also put himself into relation with the university students in other European countries, with a view to their largest possible co-operation in the interest of international good

understanding. During the present spring he has visited in this interest many students' organizations in Vienna, Budapest, and the Balkan States, going as far, indeed, as Constantinople and Athens, and devoting special attention to Italy, where both he and Mr. Louis P. Lochner, the secretary of the American Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs, were present at the International Students' Conference last autumn. This conference is to hold its next biennial session, in 1913, in the United States, and Mr. Nasmyth and Mr. Lochner have been elected respectively president and secretary of the executive committee charged with the organization of this important Congress, which, it is believed, will be of far greater moment in the international movement than the sessions hitherto held. In May Mr. Nasmyth will attend the National Peace Congress in London for the sake especially of meeting students from the different English and Scotch universities who are interested in promoting the Cosmopolitan Club movement in Great Britain. During the week of the Universal Races Congress in London, in July, the writer and Mr. Lochner, after their addresses at that Congress, were invited to be present at a meeting of an enthusiastic group of such British students, the young president of a Cosmopolitan Club at Oxford being among them; and out of this meeting came a committee for systematic effort to extend the movement to all the British universities. This movement has strongly advanced since that time, and Mr. Nasmyth is distinctly in a position to foster it, carrying as he will to its earnest adherents in Great Britain the latest news of the movement in the United States and Germany and of his intercourse with the various groups of students with whom he has conferred in so many countries during his journey this spring.

The World Peace Foundation early recognized the great importance and promise of the Cosmopolitan Club movement in our American universities. No recent educational movement in the country has been more significant than this, and none has had more rapid or striking growth. Yet hardly more than half a dozen years old, it has already spread, beginning in the University of Wisconsin, to thirty colleges and universities. Some of the clubs number two hundred students. President Eliot has recently said that the Cosmopolitan Club at Harvard University is the most interesting club in the university. The Cornell Club has recently dedicated a club-house costing \$30,000. From half to two-thirds of the members of each club are foreigners, the purpose of the clubs being to bring American and foreign students together. The clubs in the United States have now a total membership of more than two thousand students, all leagued together to pro-

mote international good understanding and brotherhood. The clubs have pleasant rooms and frequent meetings of great interest, the students from a particular nation often taking in hand a particular program, representing the music and usages of their nation. The clubs are federated in an American Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs, holding annual conventions and issuing a monthly magazine, *The Cosmopolitan Student*, which is certainly one of the most interesting students' magazines in the world, reporting not only the life and interests of the American clubs, but international movements in the student world everywhere. The American Association has recently allied itself with Corda Fratres, the international organization of European students, and is destined to be an ever greater and greater force in behalf of international fraternity. Whatever advances this sentiment is in the distinct service of the world's peace and order; and movements not expressly identified in terms with the peace cause, so called, are frequently the most potential to this end. Clearly recognizing this and caring nothing for names, the World Peace Foundation is quick to reach the hand of fellowship and re-enforcement to movements such as this. For two years the Foundation has contributed financially to the movement, making the work of its enterprising secretary and editor, Mr. Lochner, easier by relieving him of certain other distracting duties. Mr. Lochner has been the chief worker in the Association from the beginning. His unusual native ability, sympathy, zeal for the cause, and organizing skill have made him a rare force for good in our student world; and the Foundation has now secured his full time for its service, and he will be permanently connected with the Boston office, devoting himself to broader and more varied activities in behalf of the general cause in our colleges and universities. The Foundation will in no way interrupt his devotion to the Cosmopolitan Club movement, trusting indeed that he may serve it all the better; but it aims to make possible more systematic efforts for the general cause in our colleges and universities, in many ways. The Intercollegiate Peace Association, which includes thirty colleges or more in the Middle West, is an illustration of the kind of activities which should be multiplied and extended over the whole country. An international students' magazine, addressing itself to the students of all nations and representing their united interests, is one of the agencies which we desire to create and place in the hands of Mr. Lochner, Mr. Nasmyth, and their associates.

More important still is regular provision for systematic instruction in the international field in every college and university in the coun-

try. The beginnings made are, of course, most important. We have noticed the course at Stanford University. The impulse given at Mohonk some years ago by President Daniel C. Gilman and others has led to lectures, debates, prizes for essays and other provisions in scores of our higher institutions, annually reported at Mohonk; and the demands for addresses in colleges by the directors of our Foundation are constantly multiplying. But all that has been done is but slight compared with the consecutive and thorough study which is imperative. Andrew D. White has said that he never addresses a great body of students at a college commencement or on similar occasions without feeling profoundly that he speaks to representatives of the class which is to make vastly greater contributions than any other to the formation of public opinion in America; and no one has emphasized more impressively or persistently than he the necessity of making attention to international law, to the history and importance of international arbitration, and to the creation of the international habit of mind a cardinal factor in our higher education. This should be comprehended in every college curriculum; and the promotion and organization of this work the Peace Foundation views as one of its highest duties. It must command the service in this work of mature and accomplished scholars; and it appeals to generous friends of the peace cause for means to enable it to do this work in the broad way in which it should be done. Provision should be made at this time for the annual expenditure of at least \$50,000 a year for proper care of this college and university field; and the Peace Foundation invites earnest conference with those who are alive to the significance and urgency of this matter and are able to co-operate in bringing about adequate attention to it. Pending such systematic organization of this side of the work, Dr. Jordan and the writer and other directors of the Foundation are responding to as many calls as possible for separate addresses to college and university audiences. Mr. Hamilton Holt is constantly addressing such audiences. Ten of his addresses last year, and more the present year, have been through the Foundation's direct provision. Professor Philip Van Ness Myers of Cincinnati, whose co-operation with the Foundation is important in so many ways, has, during the last winter, given thirty addresses in various Southern colleges and universities, always before large and deeply interested gatherings of the students. Last summer Professor Myers devoted a whole week to lecturing before the great Summer School of the South at Knoxville, Tennessee, where in previous years, in behalf of the Peace Foundation, Rev. Walter Walsh and the writer had given similar courses of lectures.

Dr. Macdonald, of the Foundation's Board of Directors, has during the last year rendered conspicuous service alike in Canada, Great Britain and the United States. His paper, the *Toronto Globe*, is a steady and strenuous promoter of the peace cause in its own constituency; and Mr. Macdonald has addressed large numbers of clubs, religious conventions, and other gatherings in New York, Chicago, Kansas City, San Francisco, and many American centers. Dr. Jordan reports that no speaker has more deeply stirred the students of Stanford University. In Scotland last summer Mr. Macdonald addressed the General Assemblies of the two great Churches in Scotland, and he spoke several times in London, Dublin, Belfast, Glasgow and Inverness. His service in Canada especially, and in the promotion of American and English co-operation in the arbitration movement, is invaluable. The approaching celebration of the centennial of peace between Great Britain and the United States is nowhere looked forward to with deeper interest than in Canada. Our ungarded Canadian frontier has been for almost a century one of the most impressive and salutary lessons possible for the world in the safety and benefit of disarmament; and the coming celebration, synchronizing so closely as it will with the Third Hague Conference, should prove the occasion of a mighty impetus for the extension of this policy and of the reliance altogether in international practice upon the instrumentalities of justice and law. All friends of peace are under peculiar obligations to Mr. Mackenzie King and other Canadian statesmen, as well as to journalists like Mr. Macdonald, for the signal re-enforcement which they are giving the movement at this juncture.

Dr. James Brown Scott, of the Foundation's Board of Directors, is the secretary of the Carnegie Peace Endowment, in special charge of its work in international law, and in this interest he exerted a marked influence during his recent visit to Europe, as he is constantly doing in shaping the work of the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes and in so many other ways. He is the valued adviser of the Foundation in whatever pertains particularly to the province of international law; and, as will be seen by reference to the catalogue on another page, he has prepared three of the volumes in the International Library. Mr. John R. Mott has worked throughout the past year with his customary enthusiasm in interesting the young men of the churches in international fraternity, having done especially noteworthy work, as already noticed, for the promotion of education in China. He has held a series of great meetings for the students in the Swiss universities, and taken the

chief part in the international convention of Young Men's Christian Associations at Constantinople. This religious work, in Mr. Mott's hands, like the great Christian Endeavor work led by Dr. Francis E. Clark, is throwing its influence for international good understanding and good will as never before. Rev. Charles R. Brown, who during the last year has become the head of the Yale Divinity School, has given in the pulpit and before many religious and other gatherings, both in America and in England, a large number of powerful addresses in behalf of our cause, which is being served by him more influentially than by almost any other man in the American pulpit. A collection of his more important peace addresses should be published in book form. Mr. Hamilton Holt is exercising through the pages of the *Independent*, of which he is the managing editor, an untiring influence for the cause, with which the *Independent* is identified in higher measure than almost any other American journal. Mr. Holt was the president of the National Peace Congress at Baltimore in May, 1911; and he last autumn paid a visit to Japan, as has been already mentioned, giving various strong addresses there, and receiving everywhere a warm welcome. His writings and addresses in many places since his return, upon the relations of Japan and the United States, have been of distinct service; and to his valuable general lectures in behalf of the peace movement, especially in colleges, reference has already been made.

In connection with this glance at the activities of the directors of the Foundation, it should be said that the services of some of its trustees are almost or quite as constant. President Faunce and President Swain are among the most active peace workers in the country, frequently speaking for the cause before conventions and gatherings of every character. Mr. Capen is president of the Massachusetts Peace Society; and Professor Dutton is secretary of the New York Peace Society. Rev. Edward Cummings, the worthy successor of Dr. Hale in a pulpit pre-eminently devoted to the gospel of peace, has during the last winter given many stirring addresses in support of President Taft's arbitration treaties; and no argument for the constitutionality of those treaties has been more searching or influential than that of ex-Attorney General Pillsbury in the address published in our pamphlet series.

The work for the ratification of the treaties has been with the Foundation, as with the other peace agencies, a paramount work throughout the year. Many addresses have been given by its representatives; the writer has been in Washington and New York in conference with the friends of the treaties, besides speaking often in

their behalf in England; seven pamphlets have been issued in their special interest and circulated by the ten thousand; and in every possible way the Foundation has co-operated with the Citizens' National Committee, which had chief direction of the campaign throughout the country. Disappointing as is the mutilation of the treaties by the Senate, the ratification of treaties of equal or even broader scope is certainly only a question of time. The education of the people for this demand must go steadily and untiringly on; and meantime it is a satisfaction to remember that the recent campaign has probably been the occasion of more peace meetings and addresses than any other event in the history of the movement, and that it has been in the highest and most useful sense an educational campaign.

The Advisory Council of the Foundation consists of nearly seventy of the leading peace workers of the country, many of whom are very active in the movement and in constant touch with the Foundation's headquarters. It is hoped later to convene the Council annually, in New York or elsewhere, for more regular, direct, and fruitful conference. The present members of the Council are as follows:—

Miss Jane Addams
 President Edwin E. Alderman
 Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews
 President James B. Angell
 Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin
 Hon. Richard Bartholdt
 Prof. Jean C. Bracq
 Prof. John C. Branner
 John I. D. Bristol
 President S. P. Brooks
 President Elmer E. Brown
 President William L. Bryan
 Hon. Theodore E. Burton
 President Nicholas Murray Butler
 Rev. Francis E. Clark
 Prof. John B. Clark
 Rev. Samuel M. Crothers
 Rev. Charles F. Dole
 Prof. Charles T. Fagnani
 Prof. Frank F. Fetter
 President John Finley
 Hon. John W. Foster
 Hon. Eugene Hale
 Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch
 Prof. Jesse Holmes
 Prof. William I. Hull
 Rev. Charles E. Jefferson
 Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones
 President Harry Pratt Judson
 Hon. William Kent
 Prof. George W. Kirchwey
 Hon. Philander C. Knox
 Prof. Edward B. Krehbiel

Rev. Frederick Lynch
 Theodore Marburg
 S. S. McClure
 Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead
 Prof. Adolph C. Miller
 President S. C. Mitchell
 Prof. P. V. N. Myers
 Prof. Bliss Perry
 H. C. Phillips
 Hon. Jackson H. Ralston
 Prof. Paul S. Reinsch
 President Rush Rhees
 Dean Henry Wade Rogers
 Dean W. P. Rogers
 Prof. Elbert Russell
 President L. Clark Seelye
 Mrs. May Wright Sewall
 Albert K. Smiley
 Thorvald Solberg
 Hon. John H. Stiness
 Moorfield Storey
 President Charles F. Thwing
 President Charles R. Van Hise
 President George E. Vincent
 President Ethelbert D. Warfield
 Dr. Booker T. Washington
 Harris Weinstock
 Hon. Andrew D. White
 Thomas Raeburn White
 Prof. George G. Wilson
 Rabbi Stephen S. Wise
 President Mary E. Woolley
 Stanley R. Yarnall

During the year there has been one death in the Council, that of Hon. David J. Foster of Vermont, one of the most thoughtful and devoted friends of the peace cause in Congress. For years a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he was for some time its chairman; and he was the chairman of the American delegation to the General Assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome in 1911. In the promotion of the interests of this last-named great enterprise the Foundation has been earnest and active, recognizing that any institution or endeavor which fosters international co-operation in the broad way that the Institute of Agriculture does is directly in line with its own endeavors. Conceived and founded by an American citizen, David Lubin, this remarkable work makes a peculiar appeal to American international sentiment; and the Foundation has assisted Mr. Lubin in every way in its power. The writer has conferred with him in Europe, accompanied him to Washington for service with Congress, arranged hearings for him in Boston, and attended the convention of the National Grange to secure more careful attention for the International Institute. The Grange and the Government are both now alive to its importance; and the National Grange, representing a million farmers, has expressly identified itself with the peace movement. For particulars of this significant reinforcement see the pamphlet entitled "The Grange and Peace" in our pamphlet series. .

The commercial organizations of the world are responding to the appeal of the peace movement as markedly as the agricultural organizations. This is notably true in the United States. Nearly 200 of our Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce have affiliated themselves with the work of the Mohonk Arbitration Conferences. In response to the appeal of the World Peace Foundation 200 such bodies, representing the almost unanimous sentiment of the leading business men of their several cities, cities with a combined population of 21,000,000, have during the past year passed strong resolutions indorsing President Taft's arbitration treaties. Through the initiative of the World Peace Foundation, taken up by the Boston Chamber of Commerce, the next meeting of the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce has been secured for the United States, and will be held in Boston in September, 1912. This will probably be the most important commercial gathering ever held. The noteworthy liberality and enterprise of the Boston Chamber of Commerce in providing for it should be supplemented by the generous support of the city, the state and the nation; and the result must be memorable not only for commercial progress,

but for the promotion of international friendship and co-operation. This high interest is not only served indirectly by this important organization, but directly and definitely. The central administration has made the subject of international arbitration a primary feature of its programs from the beginning, and it holds the first place upon the Boston program. The world's commercial leaders and political economists are everywhere recognizing that the present war system of nations violates every principle of business and economy. The economic argument against it has been stated in this time with unanswerable power by Bloch and Norman Angell. Investments and business interests of every character are becoming more and more international; industry is international; and under these new conditions war is an anachronism and intolerable. The startling increase in the cost of living is being shown to be largely due to waste, and to no other waste so much as that upon the monstrous armaments of the nations, now more a provocation than a defence. International law and order are fundamentally essential to modern life; and none feel this more deeply than the controllers of trade and finance. The World Peace Foundation trusts that the coming Boston Congress will mark a signal advance in this sentiment, and that it will stir our American commercial leaders especially to broader and more generous co-operation with the peace agencies of the country.

The Foundation has recognized more fully than had been done by the peace agencies hitherto the great importance of the enlistment in the peace cause of the women's organizations of the country and of regular educational work in and through these. In 1909 it organized a special department for this work, placing it in charge of Mrs. Anna Sturges Duryea, an able and accomplished woman, whose work during the years which have followed has been fruitful in results. The demands upon her from the women's clubs and similar organizations have been very large and are constantly increasing. She has given hundreds of addresses, and her work is limited only by her time and strength. She spent a useful week at Chautauqua last summer, and she is constantly in attendance upon Federation meetings, patriotic societies, associations of collegiate alumnae, and clubs of many kinds, besides speaking in large numbers of schools. She has carried on an enormous correspondence; and the steady growth in the popularity and results of her work demonstrates clearly, as is done indeed by so much besides, that there should be half a dozen women doing this kind of work in different sections of the country. Mrs. Mead has of course worked in this field for several years under

other auspices. The field is unlimited and of ever-growing importance. In the women's clubs of the country alone there are now organized nearly a million women. Their social and educational work in their respective communities is an element of great significance in the life of the country. They are all well disposed toward the peace cause, and quick to respond to its appeals and to invitations to support it. At the Biennial Conference of the National Federation of Women's Clubs in 1910 the subject was for the first time given regular place upon the Federation's program, Mrs. Mead giving the address at the meeting in Cincinnati, which may be found in the volume of Proceedings; and the subject is to have similar place upon the program of the Conference at San Francisco in June. Mrs. Moore, the present president of the National Federation, is a devoted friend of the cause, and her influence has been most helpful. We ask the earnest attention of women of means throughout the country, who are alive to the importance of the subject, to the remarkable opportunities for its promotion in this field, and ask for correspondence on the part of those who may be able to co-operate with us in the more generous organization of the work. We ask all such women under whose eyes these pages may come to send to us for copies of the pamphlet which we have published containing the address by the late Justice Brewer upon "The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace," closing with a memorable statement of the peculiar obligations of women to the cause and of the decisive character of their possible influence in it. In this connection special attention is directed to the fact that the Baroness von Suttner, the famous author of "Lay Down your Arms" and the most distinguished advocate of the peace cause among the women of the world, is to visit the United States this summer under the auspices of the World Peace Foundation, remaining for several months and giving addresses in almost every section of the country. She will probably attend the convention of the National Federation of Women's Clubs at San Francisco at the end of June and the convention of the National Education Association at Chicago early in July; and the Foundation invites correspondence with all women's clubs and other organizations that desire to secure her services during the summer and autumn. Her coming to us at this time is an event of the highest importance, not second in interest to the visits of Count Apponyi and Baron d'Estournelles de Constant last year, and her reception by the peace workers throughout the country should be worthy of her conspicuous place and service in the movement.

Few women in the world have rendered more devoted service to the cause of peace during the last few years than Fräulein Anna B. Eckstein. The energy with which in 1907 she collected two million signatures to a petition in behalf of international arbitration, which she presented to the Second Hague Conference, made a deep impression upon all who read of it. In 1909 Mr. Ginn, profoundly stirred by her enthusiasm, made provision for her giving all her time to similar work with reference to the next Hague Conference, and, as she is a native German, although she has lived so long in Boston, for spending some years in addressing women's clubs and other organizations in cities in Germany, to bring American women and German women, German teachers and American teachers, and Germans and Americans generally closer together. She has held meetings in hundreds of places, not only in German cities, but in Great Britain, France and elsewhere. In the city of Munich alone she secured 125,000 signatures to her arbitration petition. Altogether she has secured many millions of signatures, and there seems no limit to her work in this direction. Perhaps the best service of such a petition is not its service as a demonstration of public sentiment, but its indirect educational service. It compels every person who signs at least to focus his mind definitely on the cause and constantly proves a provocation to serious reading and study. The zealous work of this consecrated woman has roused thousands of people in Europe and America from indifference to inquiry and co-operation.

The development of the Foundation's publicity work proceeds as rapidly as the resources permit. In addition to the publication of the Foundation's books and pamphlets, which work is constantly increasing, a large service is rendered through the supply of much material to newspapers, hundreds of which are willing and glad to use whatever is of interest and value. Mr. Denys P. Myers, who is the chief assistant in the publicity department, has a broad and thorough knowledge of international publications and movements. He has shown notable industry and intelligence in collecting and classifying material, which we need not only for our own work, but for reference by those coming to us for help. With valuable journalistic experience before he entered the service of the Foundation, he is writing untiringly, and he has prepared two of our most valuable pamphlets. His familiarity with the literature of international law is of special advantage; and he is gradually creating a reference library and a bureau of international information which are rendering growing service. Of distinct assistance in the publicity work is the Foundation's faithful and efficient business agent, Mr. Arthur W.

Allen, who is as devoted to the educational interests of the office as to its more strictly business interests. A graduate of Princeton University and at home in several European languages, his services as a translator are invaluable; and he is an especially thorough student of the economic problems of the war system and the world's armaments. He has prepared various useful cards and broadsides in this field, which have had wide circulation; and perhaps the drain of armaments has never been exhibited more strikingly than by the series of tables illustrating this which Mr. Allen has just brought together in one of the latest issues of our pamphlet series. With the entrance of Mr. Lochner into the central office, there will be still more useful co-operation in publicity work, especially as affects the educational public. The Foundation desires to extend its service as rapidly as possible in the way of periodical publications. Reference has been made to the importance of an international students' magazine. Mr. Perris in London has valuable ideas as to a more general international magazine,—ideas which should be realized. The realization of all such ideas is conditional simply upon adequate financial support. This is in every department the great need, and we commend it here again to all friends of the cause whom these pages may reach.

The Foundation has not been able to organize peace work in the churches to the degree which it desires. In 1908, and again in 1910, we secured visits to this country from the eloquent Rev. Walter Walsh of Dundee, Scotland, the author of "The Moral Damage of War," and his impassioned addresses in scores of places created deep interest and rendered conspicuous service. We shall hope to have him here again, and to arrange similar visits from other leading British preachers,—we hope from Clifford and Horton and Horne,—and for missions of American preachers to England. Reference has been made to the month's service of Rev. Charles R. Brown in London last summer. Leaders of our cause in the American pulpit, men like Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, Rev. Charles F. Dole, Rev. Edward Cummings, and Rev. Frederick Lynch, surely have a message for England as for America, and would surely have warm welcome there. It is high time that we had a broad and influential international pulpit exchange service for peace education, as we have already made so good a beginning at general exchange in our university world. In recent months Rev. Frederick Lynch has given many addresses in churches under the auspices of the Foundation, and Rev. Charles Fleischer and Rev. LaRoy F. Griffin have rendered similar service. To the constant independent peace services of the American pulpit too high tribute cannot be paid. A special

committee has just been created to secure systematic attention to international duties in all of the Unitarian churches of the country; and with this committee the Foundation is actively co-operating. Dr. Hale once said that every modern church should have a standing committee on this interest; and every church in the land should heed his behest. The Federal Council of the Churches is doing noble work in this field. We ask ministers of all churches everywhere to apply to us freely for literature. What the Foundation desires is adequate resources to organize systematic attention to the cause completely in the churches throughout the whole country; and here again it appeals to friends of the cause to enable it to secure the right men to direct this special work. This is a field where the Foundation and the Peace Societies must work together.

The Foundation aims to co-operate constantly and cordially with the other important agencies of the peace movement both at home and abroad. Nine of its trustees and directors are directors or vice-presidents of the American Peace Society. The central office in Boston co-operates especially with the New England department of the Society in the organization of State branches and in every other way in its power.* It recognizes the importance of establishing everywhere active groups, great or small, of peace workers, who shall keep the movement vital in their own neighborhoods and contribute to the membership and influence of the larger organizations; and in the promotion of this effort it desires to associate itself with every other efficient agency. There should be no large town without such a group, organizing meetings and circulating literature. Professor Dutton and the writer are two of the five American members of the International Peace Bureau at Berne; and the Foundation is in close and constant touch with the leading European workers and their organizations. Dr. Scott, the secretary of the Carnegie Endowment, is one of the Foundation's directors, and others active in the administration of the Endowment are upon its Advisory Council, facilitating useful conference; and our aim is to serve the common cause in the most intelligent possible co-operation with that great institution. Publishing many pamphlets, like the Association for International Conciliation, with whose management we are in equally cordial relations, our aim is to avoid duplication and secure the greatest mutual efficiency and good influence. With the secretary of the Mohonk Conferences, also a member of our

*A striking illustration of the devotion to the peace cause in the colleges is furnished by the fact that President Nichols of Dartmouth College has just accepted the presidency of the new New Hampshire Peace Society, and that the presidents of all the four colleges in Maine have become vice-presidents of the new Maine Society.

Advisory Council, our correspondence and general co-operation are likewise constant; and in the National and International Peace Congresses and all similar activities we aim to lend a strong hand. In the division of labor which the new conditions of the peace movement in the country clearly impose, the special office of the Peace Foundation is manifestly the educational work, which at once most fittingly comports with the spirit and experience of its founder and presents a field definite, broad in its scope, and urgent in its claims. The more popular forms of propaganda, the organization of Congresses, the management of public meetings, the prompting and presentation of petitions to governments, the influences natural to large bodies, as well as the costly work of research, are mainly for other agencies, which happily exist with greater resources than ours; although the provinces of the various agencies must always in places overlap each other, and the highest usefulness and success of all depend upon wise and cordial co-operation.

With no other of the peace agencies perhaps has our co-operation been so direct and responsible as with the American School Peace League, which is in a measure affiliated with the Foundation. This remarkably useful and potential organization was largely planned and formed in the Foundation's midst; for it was recognized that precisely such an organization was needed for peace work in the schools. It meets in the most efficient way one of the greatest of the educational needs to meet which the Foundation was established, and it meets it the more efficiently because its administration is mainly in the hands of public school men themselves, and because the leading public school men all over the country are so largely enlisted in its service. Its president is Dr. James H. Van Sickle, superintendent of schools in Springfield, Mass.; and we ask the attention of all teachers to its singularly strong list of officers in all parts of the country, as published in its last annual report, which we are glad to send to all applicants. Its secretary and executive officer, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, has shown an organizing skill unsurpassed in these years in any field of the peace work; and she has succeeded not only in extending the organization into almost every State in the Union, but has prompted the inauguration of similar work in Europe. A strong British School Peace League is already in active existence through her initiative; and at this time she is perfecting the organization of an International Council, in which work she is having the earnest co-operation of Baron d'Estournelles, Count Apponyi, the Baroness von Suttner, and many of the leading peace workers in Europe. The National Education Association has unanimously indorsed the work,

and the annual conventions of the League, in connection with the last two conventions of the Association, in Boston and San Francisco, have been most impressive meetings. The work of the committees of the League charged with the improvement of historical text-books and the general teaching of history in the schools, with the preparation of new studies in social and political morals, with the proper observance in the schools of the Eighteenth of May, the anniversary of the meeting of the First Hague Conference, and the adequate presentation at educational conferences and through the educational press of the principles of the international movement, is work of the most beneficent and imperative character; and it is being done with ever broader scope and ever larger results. The Foundation is able at present to help support this great work only to the extent of \$2,500 a year. The League's total annual income is less than \$10,000. It ought to be ten times that. There is no field where peace work is more necessary or where it counts for more than in the schools. There is no class more ready to co-operate in the great work than the teachers of the country; and the movement already so splendidly started should be powerfully reinforced. The present United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Claxton, has no interest more profoundly at heart than this; and there is hardly a prominent educator in the country who is not earnestly with us. The writers of the school histories are more and more catching the spirit of the commanding international movement. Professor Myers, in the last editions of his popular text-book on Modern History,—and this is typical of the present advance in the schools,—has incorporated a final chapter upon "The World State," showing the boys and girls that the struggles and commotions of the ages find their justification and interpretation only as we see that an increasing purpose has pervaded them, and that the tumultuous process is surely leading on and up to international order and co-operation. It is in this confidence and to advance this end that the School Peace League has been called into existence and is doing its great work. We ask all patriotic and serious men and women, all lovers of their country and of humanity, to study the work, to consider its possibilities and its urgent needs; and we ask all those who are able to do it to help us strengthen this department of the work of peace education.

It is to this work of education that the World Peace Foundation is devoted, education both in the broader and the stricter sense,—work for the creation of an intelligent and well-informed public opinion upon the international issues of the time, and work in the schools and colleges to train the rising generation to right thinking and right

feeling upon these issues, based upon a true historical background and a true instead of a false patriotism. We shall have a worthy and reliable international sentiment, a sentiment that will be proof against popular passion and able to resist the follies and storms of dangerous crises, when we first have a generation thoroughly trained to right reason. It is only upon such definite and pervasive education that we can permanently or safely depend; and it is to the educational agencies of society, the school, the university, the church, the press, the library, and associations of men and women organized for study and thought, that the World Peace Foundation addresses itself and, through the printed page and the spoken word, offers its services. It aims to serve the other peace agencies by providing for their use, as well as for its own, the completest collection of books and pamphlets in the interest of the cause, and gradually for a body of the ablest speakers for every field of the work; and it hopes, by faithful service in its special province, to do its part with the various agencies, old and new, now so hopefully uniting, with so much greater resources and so much better organization than ever before, for the efficient service of this commanding cause of the world's peace and order.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

JUNE, 1912.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
- Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
- Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
- Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
- Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
- Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
- Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
- Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
- Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
- Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
- Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
- Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
- Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By CHARLES F. DOLE

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
- THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
- THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

-
- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

NEUTRALIZATION

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

BY

ERVING WINSLOW

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

July, 1912, No. 6, Part II

Entered as second-class matter, April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY.

Neutralization as "the true road to a perpetual peace" (Whewell) deserves a far more general and serious consideration than it has received. It is not known that any report has been made upon the subject by the Berne *Bureau International Permanent de la Paix*, to which it was referred by the Peace Congress of 1904, and the doctrine has found comparatively few advocates, in spite of the fact that it contains an appeal not only to the common sense, but to the imagination of mankind, while it has actually been most successfully applied for a long period of time in some notable instances. Had public opinion caused the powers within recent years to accept the doctrine, it might have been beneficently applied to Egypt, Korea, Persia and various "weaker peoples" whose nationality has been destroyed by arrangements made in diplomatic trades and acquiesced in by the greater nations to satisfy greed and ambition, or to preserve the so-called balance of power.

Neutralization of nations by their own act and by treaty between the great powers means the establishment not of methods to bring about peace, but of peace itself, the beginning of a genuine crystalizing process, self-expanding and progressive. Arbitration assumes difficulties which may lead to war. It may be sought or, in many specific cases, avoided at will. Neutralization implies the noble abandonment of that sovereign right which permits of war. Its authority is the pledge of the nations, guaranteed by enlightened public sentiment.

Neutralization is the creation of the world of Christianity. For the word "neutrality" the Latin and the Greek have no equivalent. The heathen nations knew nothing but the inveterate exercise of an all-embracing warfare. The idea of limiting the horrors of war to the contending forces by the abstention of neutrals was the product of the new life that was developed by the Renaissance. The statesmen and the lawyers of that time invented for the characterization of the new principle *neutralis* and *neutralitas*, linguistic barbarisms, interesting because they prove its novelty. Even in Machiavelli's day the precept of the Florentine seems to have been generally accepted, that a state should never be neutral, because, as he argued, in case the combatants were strong the neutral would become a prey of the con-

queror, and in case they were weak the neutral would forego the opportunity to dominate its victorious ally.

Neutrality was hardly touched upon by the earlier writers on international law. Wheaton recognizes two types of neutrality,—perfect and imperfect. "Perfect neutrality" arises from the spontaneous attitude of the neutral state itself. This attitude is supposed to be controlled by international law; yet this is in such a formative state that the question has been propounded seriously whether it can properly be called law at all, having no authority to enforce its edicts. Some writers on the subject have rested the claim for its inclusion in jurisprudence upon the definition of the author of the Ecclesiastical Polity, the "judicious" Hooker, that law is "any rule or canon whereby actions are framed." It is obviously proper enough to introduce moral and philosophical considerations therefore into its discussions, and they are certainly pertinent to "imperfect, qualified, or conventional neutrality," which is the result of treaty agreement between the powers (constituting the act of neutralization) wholly beyond the operation of international judicature, if such there be. This kind of neutrality has as yet received but little expert attention. One critic asserts, indeed, that Wheaton's classification—in which Halleck follows him—cannot be maintained, because the condition described in the second division might imply an agreement of the neutralized state made before the outbreak of war to do something inimical to one of the belligerents. Of course, Wheaton's "conventionally neutralized" state could never be supposed to contract obligations in time of peace inconsistent with its peculiar duties in time of war, to refrain from such obligations being an essential quality of neutralization.

Permanent neutrality is an idea of our own times, recognized first at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. There are, indeed, a few instances of earlier and unsuccessful attempts at its application. Notably Switzerland from 1521 onward had treaties of perpetual peace with France and most of the other states of Europe, together constituting a series of alliances which is characterized by contemporary writers as effecting Swiss neutrality. The treaty of July 25, 1791 between Leopold II. and the King of Prussia contained a secret article by which Russia was invited to join in an agreement to maintain the boundaries and free constitution of Poland. This treaty, amounting merely to a recognition of the independence of the Polish State, and providing in no way for its neutrality, disappeared in a subsequent agreement for the Second Partition. The general Recess of the German Empire, following the Peace of

Lunéville, accorded "perpetual neutrality" to six free and independent cities, Augsburg, Lübeck, Nuremberg, Frankfurt, Bremen and Hamburg, "so long as they shall remain members of the Empire and refrain from such hostilities as the Holy Empire might undertake in the future." Neither of these attempts can be considered examples of true neutralization.

The first use of the term in a treaty between several states occurs in the Treaty of Amiens in 1802 between France and her allies and England, with regard to the neutralization of Malta, which never received the ratification of the powers, and is therefore only important as an expression on the part of European nations of the value and true nature of perpetual neutrality in removing territories forever from the realm of war through the means of international agreement.

The terminology of the subject has been uncertain even in state papers and treaties, so that in the popular mind there is much confusion, the doctrine of neutrality having been even extended to cover the immunity conferred upon military hospitals, ambulances and Red Cross representatives, now more properly characterized as "inviolability."

The name of neutralization has been loosely applied to the agreement made between the United States and Great Britain in 1817 to maintain a merely nominal force on the Great Lakes, and it seems inaccurate to apply the term to arrangements for the abstention from fortifying highways of commerce. The assent of the great powers of Europe, and of the United States since the precedent of Geneva of 1864, is essential to the neutralization of territory. It is this neutralization which seems the only measure that offers itself with an absolute and reasonable hope of a really solid and permanent peace.

The development of individual liberty within the state follows the settlement of public order. With a similar progression the individual nation now seeks, for the first time, the opportunity for itself which may be obtained through the established comity of nations. Hitherto the neutralization of a state has been established not primarily for its own advantage, but for the safety and for the benefit of its more powerful neighbors.

Such was the motive for Swiss neutralization. By the Treaty of Paris, May 30, 1814, the limits of France were reestablished virtually as they had existed in 1792. By a separate and secret article of this treaty, the disposal of the territories renounced by France in the open treaty and the conditions tending to produce a system of real and

durable equilibrium in Europe were to be decided upon by the allied powers among themselves. Thus, while the Treaty of Paris was made between France, Great Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria, the pacificatory and restorative measures were confided to the allied four great powers. France was to have no vote in the congress, which was convened by these powers in conformity with the secret article of the Paris Treaty. But when it assembled at Vienna, November 1, 1814, the adroit audacity of Talleyrand and the disagreement of the allies secured for France a prominent position of influence. Eight powers actually composed the congress,—Great Britain, Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, Spain, Portugal and Sweden. Russia's claims upon Poland created a disagreement among the powers, as did the claims of Prussia upon a part of the same territory and upon the Rhine provinces. But the final act, which Spain alone refused to sign, was agreed upon June 9, 1815. The status of Switzerland was determined by a declaration of the powers forming the congress, dated March 20, 1815, by the act of accession of the cantons of the same date, and by the final act. Switzerland by these acts and declarations was to take the relation of perpetual neutrality, and (in order to secure this end the better) a treaty with the King of Sardinia, of May 15, 1815, provided that the Provinces of Chablais and Faucigny, south of Lake Geneva, and all of Savoy north of Ugines, were to hold the same neutral attitude. Thus Switzerland, Chablais and Faucigny, and all Savoy north of Ugines were made neutral. This position of Switzerland, so constituted in 1815 for the sake of the peace of Europe, has never been changed, and the other powers have always substantially respected its neutrality.

Holland and Belgium were united by the congress. They were disrupted in 1830, and perpetual Belgian neutrality was imposed by a protocol of January 20, 1831, Article V. of which guarantees it in the name of the five great powers,—Great Britain, Russia, France, Austria and Prussia. This protocol was confirmed by the Treaty of London of November 15, 1831. It was not until after the Treaty of London of April 19, 1839, which established peace between Belgium and the Netherlands, that all the states of Europe recognized the kingdom of Belgium and its neutral status. This condition was established in order that the kingdom might be a barrier between the rivals, France and Germany. Its integrity has been preserved. It was threatened indeed during the Franco-Prussian war in 1870, when Great Britain immediately concluded two conventions—one between herself, Belgium and Prussia, and another between herself, Belgium and France—the conditions of which were that, if France violated the

integrity or neutrality of Belgium, Great Britain would join her forces to those of Prussia and, *mutatis mutandis*, that, if Prussia were the aggressor, Great Britain would ally herself to France.

The Dutch United Provinces, with the larger part of the Austrian Netherlands, were constituted into a Kingdom of the Netherlands, under the Prince of Orange-Nassau, including the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and a part of the Duchy of Bouillon. The Grand Duchy of Luxemburg was added to Holland as an independent state, becoming a member of the German Confederation, and its boundaries, established at Vienna, were changed by the act annexed to the treaty of April 19, 1839. A part of the old territory of Luxemburg was taken from the Kingdom of the Netherlands and annexed to the Duchy of Limburg. After the disruption of the German Confederation in 1866, Luxemburg was garrisoned by Prussian troops. But, owing to the remonstrances of France, the matter was brought before a conference of the powers in London, and by treaty of May 11, 1867, between Great Britain, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Prussia and Russia, the *status quo ante* of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg was restored and it was made an open city (*ville ouverte*), while all the parties to the treaty agreed to respect its neutrality. Luxemburg, on her part, agreed to disarm and dismantle the frontier forts and all others within her boundaries, the provision of neutrality rendering them unnecessary. The city of Luxemburg was to cease being a fortified city, the Grand Duke of Luxemburg, however, being permitted to keep a stated body of troops for the police protection of his own subjects. Prussia agreed to withdraw all troops that had previously been maintained within the boundaries of Luxemburg. The Grand Duke of Luxemburg was to take all necessary steps, by virtue of his position as Grand Duke, to carry into effect the provisions of the treaty, and to convert the city of Luxemburg from an armed to an open city. In 1870, during the Franco-Prussian War, Prussia complained that France had violated the neutrality of Luxemburg. This caused much discussion and correspondence. The treaty of neutralization was not, however, disavowed by Prussia. Since that time the neutrality of Luxemburg has been respected by all the powers.

The neutralization of the two Ionian islands, Corfu and Paxos, presents points of distinct interest. All the Ionian islands in 1815 were placed under the protectorate of Great Britain, which in 1863 consented, in order to have a Danish prince elected King of Greece, to renounce this protectorate in favor of Greece. The treaty of November 14, 1863, between England, Austria, France, Prussia and

Russia, established the perpetual neutrality of the Ionian isles. A treaty of March 29, 1864, restricted the neutrality to Corfu, Paxos and their dependencies, though it has been doubted whether they are really safeguarded, otherwise than through the obligations assumed by Greece.

The city of Cracow and its territory were made a neutral state by the Congress of Vienna in 1815, under the joint protection of Russia, Prussia and Austria; but it was claimed that the failure of Cracow to fulfill the obligations assumed by her, not to afford an asylum to fugitives from justice or military deserters, vitiated the conditions of the agreement, and the city lost her liberty in 1846.

Neutralization is not demanded to-day for the protection of the great powers from belligerent operations. The smaller and weaker states are demanding for themselves the privileges of neutralization, with the consequent relief from the dangers of aggression, intimidation or annexation, and from the heavy burdens of militarism. In our time these privileges and their guaranty are coming to be recognized as an individual and personal right of the state. Norway has secured for herself a partial, and desires a general, neutralization. The subject is being agitated in Holland. Many publicists in Denmark promote the effort for the neutralization of that kingdom, which has been so ably advocated, in particular by F. de Martens; and a movement was made in Santo Domingo to instruct its delegates to urge its neutralization at The Hague. The neutralization of the Suez Canal was effected by the international convention of 1888; but the Panama Canal, though declared neutral in perpetuity by the treaty between Panama and the United States of November 18, 1903, in conformity with the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, November 18, 1901, is to be fortified, according to a right reserved in the United States-Panama treaty for "the protection of neutrality." This fact, together with the semi-official assertion now made that the construction of the canal was a military measure, removes this undertaking, it is sad to state, from the category of peace measures through the promotion of international commerce, in which it was at first hopefully classed.

Dean Henry Wade Rogers in the course of his very able address at the Baltimore Peace Congress in May, 1911, observed:—

It must be conceded that no treaty now in force in express terms denies to this government the right to fortify the canal. It must, however, be admitted that the existing treaties bind this country in express terms to neutralize it. That makes it necessary to determine whether we can neutralize and fortify at the same time, or whether neutralization and fortification are not absolutely antagonistic in principle.

Dr. Rogers cited the stipulated demolition of the fortresses of Belgium, the Ionian islands, Luxemburg and Savoy as a condition of their neutralization, as well as the treaty obligations forbidding military-maritime arsenals along the coast of the Black Sea as needless and purposeless, and, similarly, fortifications on the Lower Danube. He continued:—

There are writers on international law who say that neutralization "implies the absence of fortifications." Latané says "the mere existence of fortifications would impeach the good faith of the parties to the agreement." Prof. John Bassett Moore of Columbia, one of the foremost authorities in this country, writes: "The idea of neutrality or of neutralization has usually been deemed incompatible even with the mere maintenance of armed forces and fortifications." But it is not simply a question of whether we have or have not a legal right to fortify. The claim the friends of non-fortification make is that the United States should negotiate a convention with the Great Powers of the world similar to the Constantinople Convention of 1888, which guarantees that the Suez Canal shall be immune from attack in time of war, and that it shall not be permanently fortified. To this it is answered that the United States cannot trust the honor of the nations. They tell us that treaties are broken. The answer is that individual treaties have sometimes been broken, but that a convention signed by great nations would be kept. One convention neutralizing the Suez Canal has never been broken. . . . If the United States is to fortify the canal, it must defend it against all nations. It is safer unfortified. Under the Hague Convention of 1907 it is contrary to the rules of war to bombard unfortified coasts.

The Panama Canal as a military asset is of questionable value. Rear Admiral Evans is quoted as saying that it cannot be so fortified as to protect a fleet passing through the canal. A hostile fleet at the exits would capture or destroy the war ships as they come out one by one and before they could form in line of battle. Rear Admiral Dewey is also reported as opposed to any policy of fortification. Fortification is unnecessary and worse than useless. Fortifications invite attack. "They draw the lightning of battle," and are not less a safeguard than a danger.

We are told that there was at least one spot in Greece, the small island of Delos, which was dedicated to the gods, and kept at all times sacred from war. It is said that no hostile foot ever pressed its kindly soil. Would that the United States, adhering to its original policy, had dedicated the Panama Canal Zone, ten miles wide and fifty miles long, as a spot to be held henceforth sacred from all the operations of war! Through this artery of commerce uniting the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific the ships of the world should pass and repass in perfect safety. The Panama Canal, like the Suez, should have remained unfortified and been made immune from attack by agreement of the nations.

The greater the number of neutralized states, the more remote in a geometrical ratio become the possibilities of war. It is a striking fact that the crises which have threatened the neutrality of Switzerland and Belgium have been averted in a manner which would inevitably suggest the intervention of a special Providence to one class of minds and to another furnish convincing evidence that neutralization is not a weakness, but emphasizes the strength and permanency of peace.

The neutralized state itself renounces all idea of international contests. It exists essentially for the moral and commercial progress of its inhabitants. Such a state will be a strong advocate of disarmament.

ment and of arbitration. Of course, the people of such states must put behind them those doctrines which it was supposed that the world, and the United States in particular, had well outgrown, that war and the preparations for war are essential to manly vigor, and that, when the sword is turned into the plowshare, mankind will necessarily become a race of effeminate weaklings.

The neutralized state is excluded from such sovereign functions only as concern war-making and its attributes, or which may in any way compromise the position established by international law as essential to neutrality. The surrender of these functions has no meaning to the weaker states, whose reception of the great gift involves only a technical sacrifice of national dignity.

It is exceedingly important to make a careful discrimination between protectorates and neutralization, or between limited neutralization of provinces and that of an entire country, in view of many vague discussions of this subject which have exhibited a limited grasp of its true character. It is very common to quote the failure of the protectorate over Samoa as a warning against the association of powers to neutralize territory, and the lapsing of a joint Egyptian protectorate is likewise sometimes quoted to the same effect. But as no state can be neutralized by its own *ipse dixit*, neither can the condition be created by action of two or three nations. As a matter of fact, such a joint protectorate is less stable, and therefore farther removed from the equilibrium established by general consent, than the protectorate of a single nation by tacit consent of the other powers. The opportunity for jealousies and misunderstandings is so obvious that practical experience was hardly needed to demonstrate it, and, of course, the "protected" nation is unlikely to have any proper opportunity to develop its own powers as an independent state. It is universal consent which is the essential element of true neutralization.

The limited or provincial neutralization of a part of the territory of a state is likewise anomalous, and its non-success furnishes no argument against the fulfillment of the true ideal. The acquisition of Savoy by France in 1860, ratified by a plebiscite, broke that province away from the neutralized territories of Switzerland, of which it formed a part by the Vienna and Paris treaties of 1815; and although the French Government recognized that some limitations upon the rights of sovereignty still restrained Savoy, by assenting to Switzerland's remonstrance against fortification of the frontier, the guaranty of neutralization has not been maintained by the treaty powers.

An important consideration, of course, is that a weak neutralized state may be unable to fulfill the responsibilities which are ordinarily

attached to the position, notably to prevent a belligerent from using its lands or harbors or from making them a basis of hostile operations. In the method suggested, of converting the weaker nations into neutralized states, we must revert to the basis of what Whewell calls "international *jus*" rather than to any existing code of laws. It must be assumed that the state, being divested of all means of forcible resistance, as is implied by her amicable attitude, is unable to resist such violations of her territory. It would not ordinarily be desirable that one great nation, by individual action, should intervene to control both belligerents, as Great Britain did in the case of Belgium previously mentioned; for the association of the neutralizing powers implies that, though two or more might be engaged in war, they are all enlisted to preserve the sanctity of the contract,—irrevocable, except by general consent,—to maintain inviolate, as against any one or any group of them, the neutralized territory. The establishment of this attitude implies a permanent comity of nations to maintain the peace, at least in neutralized territories.

As in the limit as to time afforded by the Truce of God, or like that which was vainly attempted by the Vatican to give pause to the impending war between the United States and Spain, so the limit placed by territorial lines must exercise an important influence upon the forces which make for war. If the whole movement toward the establishment of international law is based upon the progress of humane and moral ideas, it is no mere chimerical aspiration to regard as hopelessly possible the largest increase of its sanctions in this direction. Every year in which the great powers stand associated, even though prompted at first by mutual jealousies, as sponsors for the peace of portions of the world's territory, the more firmly established is the precedent, crystallizing into a rule of international law, that a state once neutralized must so remain. That the great powers, whatever temporary disturbances may arise between some of them, would all stand together for the guaranty established by them all in perpetuity, becomes more and more probable. It is easy to see what an important influence may be exerted upon warlike motives by this underlying and common pledge of a protected peace, growing deeper and stronger as the spheres in which it prevails become larger and more numerous. That objections by neighboring states and perhaps in other quarters may be raised to the neutralization of territory is conceded, but it is perfectly obvious that these objections have proceeded from selfish and narrow motives and may disappear with a larger political consciousness, which looks to the reign of peace and of law.

The most interesting aspect of neutralization, however, is its application to the undeveloped nations, the people of the East and of the tropical countries. National consciousness is awakening through the general progress of enlightenment, and especially under the impulse which has followed the entrance of Japan among the world powers. In the Philippine Islands we are daily fostering it by an extensive educational system. The movements and the demands of commerce and industry in the present conditions are inflicting heavy and still heavier burdens upon the dependent peoples, whose interests are often ruthlessly sacrificed to the requirements of exploitation. It is difficult to believe that this growing national consciousness and the desires and ambitions which accompany it will long be content with control by any sort of foreign rule.

Is it not the part of those who make a study of international law to anticipate and to provide for that extension of it which may furnish some orderly and methodical system for the transition of possessions, dependencies and some of the colonies to the self-governing attitude which, before long, will be claimed by those now living under more or less enforced tutelage? One eminent authority, Sir Thomas Barclay, in his recent valuable monograph, "Problems of International Practice and Diplomacy," observes:—

Might it not become a principle in the public law of Europe, following more or less on the lines of Articles X., XI. and XII. of the general act of Berlin of February 28, 1885, that any nation or self-governing colony shall be enabled, on fulfilling certain conditions, to claim neutralization?

Sir Thomas Barclay even provides a scheme for "a form of agreement as to the proclamation of neutralization."

A famous divine, whose interpretations of Christian principles seem to be based on the assumption that the Scripture text that their fruit "is not peace, but a sword" was a statement of justifiable action instead of a prophetic warning, has summed up the matter. He asserts that the "civilized" peoples, who are alone fitted to develop and expand the resources of nature, are the "ox" which is entitled to the manger and to its contents, and from these the heathen "dog," if he is in the way, should be forced to retire. Unfortunately, these "civilized" people of the temperate zones, although able to plan methods of administration and development, are unable themselves to perform the manual labor demanded, which, even if it were not climatically impossible for them, would be altogether too expensive. Thus, in the pressure for rapid development, the native inhabitants must either perform the necessary labor at the price which permits a profit to his "benefactor," as it is customary to call his owner, or

he must go to the wall. The alternative is, of course, that the peon or the coolie is imported to perform the work demanded.

Much has been said of the excellent administration of Siam and the Straits Settlements, the former of which, of course, is a sovereign state, although the people are one of the weaker peoples. Yet it is the fact that by imported labor the natives are almost completely shut out from industrial opportunity. In South Africa this menace has aroused remonstrances which have moved the British Government to efforts to restrain the introduction of foreign labor at the expiration of engagements already entered into. Jealous as the great nations and their colonies are of the entrance into their territories of such labor as the Chinese and other alien races supply (even rigidly excluding, as is done by the United States, the entrance of any form of it under contract), the weaker peoples have been subjected to the competition of imported labor almost without restraint. We should prepare for the day when the *ægis* of international law may be so extended as to protect, as their protest makes itself heard, the nations who are suffering in a manner that must otherwise lead to their final extinction.

It is true that some generous and voluntary guidance might be beneficial, and might even be sought by the weaker peoples in their national evolution. But this should be given beyond the sphere of international law, whose function might well be extended to protect them from and prevent that kind of interference which tends to crush the national life. Before the establishment of those maxims and rules which have developed with the growing comity of nations, the stronger was free to conquer the weaker, to destroy its property and to slaughter its people. While recognizing the advance toward a better day, is there such an advance in the actual state of the relations between the more powerful and the weaker, under the guise of a benevolent trusteeship, as might have been anticipated? We are fully aware, to be sure, that the scientific process of evolution which demands the survival of the fittest might seem to be retarded by an effort to strengthen and support the feeble among the nations. Who shall decide that any race of men has no capacity to use, no value in the scheme of the universe? While progressive philanthropy and all the beneficent influences which are commonly denominated Christian, and the institutions of jurisprudence themselves, do not hesitate to defy the scientific theory in the case of the feeble individual, its dictum is not likely to hinder the growing demand for a similarly benevolent treatment of the affairs of feeble nations.

Neutralization would recognize the individual right of the nationality to its own existence and to its own progress, though that progress might be less rapid than expected by the civilized world, and certainly much slower than would be desired by the greed of the exploiter. It is for the law of nations, like the ordinary laws of society, to recognize, to respect, and to secure individual liberty. Slavery only knows no law. The whole theory which has prevailed under the name of trusteeship implies the assumption that the beneficent influences of civilization could be extended only through the form of ownership, without which no moral, social and commercial influences would exert any considerable effect. With such an object lesson as Japan before its eyes, the world can hardly deny that the growth and development of self-government is possible without ownership, guardianship or protectorate. Had Admiral Dewey sailed away from the Philippine Islands as Commodore Perry sailed away from Japan, another national life in the East, with a proper security, might have grown well toward an acknowledged maturity.

Of course, it is not to be expected that the land hunger of the more densely populated countries will soon be removed by an outflow of emigration to independent countries, or that the great nations will very willingly part with their colonies and possessions. But may not a time come when there will be recognized the freedom of individuals to go to places where their labor is needed and where they can be assimilated, subject only to the control of their hosts, the natural owners of the soil? National barriers are not a hindrance to the free movements of persons, as they are to the exchange of articles of commerce, and the recognition of the rights of humanity beyond the limits of nationality will really tend to strengthen rather than to weaken the nations. Friendly alliance and free commercial intercourse are of mutual benefit, and the phlebotomy of emigration has relieved the nation which is suffering from the plethora of a congested population, while it has assisted and stimulated the development of sparsely settled states. The experience of the world has proved that, though colonial enterprise may have been profitable to a few individuals and a limited number of interests, it has often been prejudicial rather than advantageous to the parent country.

It is obvious that the unrest which manifests itself in the subject state, however diplomatically it may be met, is unlikely to be allayed. The demands of Egypt, of India and of South Africa are sure to become more and more insistent. In fact, the ruling state, even if not forced to relinquish its control through sheer financial and physical inability, will probably be obliged sooner or later to conform to the

growing sense of justice among its own people and to take measures to set adrift its ambitious dependency. The new school of thought in England is recognizing the possibility of ultimately freeing its subject peoples, and the duty of giving them now larger and larger measures of local self-government. When the time comes for their graduation into the ranks of self-governing nations, since they cannot have sufficient strength for defense, obviously the parent nation could hardly fail to see that they were given proper protection. How could this be so adequately effected as by a request to the other powers that they should join with it in the establishment of a permanent neutralization for the new states? Of course, this does not imply a severance from the world at large in those ways in which the interests of commerce, missionary zeal, the spirit of humanity and international brotherhood exert themselves, without regard to definitions of sovereignty. It may be conceded that it is as true of philanthropy and Christianity as it is of trade, that they do not "follow the flag." Individual service would not be wanting where it was needed, like that which Gordon gave in China and which has been rendered to many another nation by less well-known lovers of their kind, neither for greed, ambition nor love of power. The brotherly love, such as Stevenson manifested for his Samoans, would never be found wanting, though the clamors of selfishness were silent, when the need for help made itself heard. Are we to suppose that all the beneficent influences that are now being exerted in the Philippines, for instance, are being done for pay or from national pride,—that Bishop Brent and all his fellow-workers would cease their efforts if the Philippine Islands were to be made a neutralized state? From the evidence given by the inhabitants during the period of the government at Malolos, it is obvious that eagerness for such help was latent there, and that it was eagerly welcomed and supported. It cannot be forgotten that officers, captured from our army during the war between the Filipinos and the United States, were paroled and hired to teach in the native schools.

The basis of the idea of neutralization as applied to the weaker peoples of course rests upon a confidence in self-development and is a direct outcome of true democratic principles. It is to be believed that, in spite of temporary curves of depression, these principles are, on the whole, making a continued upward progress. It is undoubtedly true, as has been said, that, waiving its effect upon the native inhabitants of the soil, material progress is more rapidly stimulated by the sovereignty of the more developed nations. An indefinite rapidity of development is, however, not altogether desirable, as is

evidenced by the recurrence of the financial and commercial crises which we call panics. Fostered by artificial trade regulations and the ingenuity of great financiers and captains of industry, feverish periods of speculative activity are followed by the cold fit in which the patient shudders in despair, and a great recession takes place from the overhasty advance. The lesson which the world is gradually learning from the results of intense and hasty greed, far overpassing the benefits which its enterprises are supposed to bestow, would be reinforced by the example of independent states pursuing their course under methods which lack the intemperate fervor of Western exploitation. It is undoubtedly true that the people of the tropical countries, unaffected by the influence and example of the energetic residents of the temperate zone, might have rested content with their easy opportunities for procuring the simple necessities of life. If peoples thus conditioned were to have been allowed at a remote period to enter the family of nations by such a process as neutralization, they might have remained satisfied with the exchange of such natural products as their lands afforded for the few articles required to supply their needs, manufactured by people of a higher development. But, as the matter presents itself to-day, contact with the world has planted the seeds of ambition among these peoples. Their needs and their desires are increasing with the growth of national consciousness and their movement toward independence. Such countries of their own initiative could never supply the field nor offer an opportunity for large manufacturing enterprises, and there would therefore be no inducement for them to erect tariff walls. The effect upon the equilibrium of trade would be indisputably excellent: a natural export consisting of local products; and an importation, to a moderately increasing degree, of the products of manufacture required by the growing wants of an advancing civilization.

We have in the United States some continuing faith in what is called the Monroe Doctrine, which, from whatever motive it was established, is supposed to secure for the states of the South American continent conditions which may in a sense be called those of neutralization. But, besides the fact that the intrusion of the United States into the Eastern hemisphere has, in the view of many, undermined the foundations of the doctrine, no assertion of such guaranty as the Monroe Doctrine is supposed to furnish should be made by any single state. This guaranty by a single state cannot be viewed as a world-peace measure. In fact, it may easily be provocative of war. The great rival powers, each maintaining that it alone is the true arbiter of peace and that its sovereign will should be the supreme arbiter in

cases of territorial differences and dispute, are competing to lead in military and especially in naval strength. The United States, it is now claimed, has not only to maintain a navy sufficient to defend its possessions in the other hemisphere, but has to guard against aggressions upon its own home territory and upon the whole South American continent. But, with neutralized territory no longer a cause of difference or dispute, the naval forces would be released or could be converted to police duty. In the ideal conditions of international law and practice a small "union navy" of this sort would be the substitute for the futile and wasteful expenditures of our menacing naval armaments.

It is possible, of course, that a neutralized nation might fail to develop any kind of orderly government for a long time, that there might be violence and bloodshed, and that the government established more or less permanently might be an oligarchy or a despotism. The free will of nations is as respectable as the free will of individuals. We do not attempt to restrain the liberty of the individual, even though we think he might be governed infinitely better by others than he is able to govern himself, unless he interferes with others' rights and liberties. Neutralization recognizes the free individuality of the state, and that its affairs should not be directly controlled by foreign nations or indirectly controlled by them, as is the case when the burden of militarism is laid upon it by its liability to attack. The present situation may be not inaptly compared to that which would exist if the protection of the law exerted by common consent were removed and the weaker individual, who could not protect himself by his fists, were forced to go about armed to the teeth to defend himself from possible assaults upon his person.

No discussion in the United States of the subject of neutralization can be made without recalling the fact that at the first participation of this country in the counsels of the great powers Mr. John A. Kasson, in her behalf, at the Berlin Conference, urged the neutralization of the territories comprising the conventional basin of the Congo. The conference, although deeply impressed by Mr. Kasson's arguments, did not then enter into a compact which might, in case of war, deprive the belligerent of the means of attack, although a recommendation was adopted that the parties which might be concerned in a future act of war should establish and respect the neutrality of these territories. In accordance with this recommendation, on August 1, 1885, Leopold II. of Belgium, who had then become the head of the independent state of the Congo, caused the powers to be informed that in conformity with Article 10 of the Berlin Treaty the inde-

pendent state of the Congo had assumed the duties which neutrality imposes.

Many publicists have suggested the plan of neutralization to be applied the Philippine Islands when the independence which is contemplated for them shall come to pass. When this independence is granted, it will be necessary in some sort to provide for the undisturbed preservation of the national life. The idea of neutralization was propounded by James G. Blaine more than a quarter of a century ago, when in 1881 he made this statement in behalf of the Government of the United States: "It firmly believes that the position of the Hawaiian Islands as the key to the domain of the American Pacific demands their benevolent neutrality, to which end it will earnestly coöperate with the native government"; and it was only as an alternative that the astute statesman added that, "if through any cause the maintenance of such a position of benevolent neutrality should be found by Hawaii to be impracticable, this Government would then unhesitatingly meet the altered situation by seeking an avowedly American solution for the grave issues presented." Had the perpetual neutralization of the Sandwich Islands been established by the consent of all the great powers, the first step might not have been taken in a direction which is still regarded very much as it was regarded when Mr. Fish wrote in 1873: "The acquisition of territory beyond the sea, outside the present confines of the United States, meets the opposition of many discreet men who have more or less influence in our councils."

Mr. Edwin Burritt Smith many years ago, in the early days of their struggle for independence, urged the neutralization of the Philippine Islands. At a later date Mr. John Foreman, who has made many valuable contributions to the discussions of Philippine affairs, declared that if, when she "destroyed the protecting power of Spain in the Philippine Islands, the United States had practically said to the Filipinos: 'You are henceforth a free people; work out your own destiny; for no nation which has become great was ever made;—it made itself. We will from this moment endeavor to persuade all the great powers to join us in declaring your independence and neutrality'—if that had been America's attitude, then the world would have hailed such unprecedented mutual self-abnegation, and the powers might probably have agreed to America's proposal."

In an able argument before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, April 6, 1906, in support of a joint resolution introduced by the Hon. Samuel W. McCall in the House, January 4, 1906, Mr. Moorfield Storey said:—

That it is feasible to obtain such an agreement for neutralization is, I think, hardly doubtful. In the first place, if we ask the powers of the world to make this agreement with us, we are not asking them to give us anything. The Philippine Islands in their eyes now belong to us. They are not subjects for foreign aggression. To interfere with them means war with us, and that is what no foreign power is at present seeking. Therefore, when we ask them to agree, that we decide that it is proper to give the Filipinos their independence, they will keep their hands off. We are asking them to give nothing. The request, if made now, is made at a peculiarly favorable time. There never was in the history of the world a time when the friendship of the United States was so much desired by everybody as it is at this moment. There are many of us who come down from a former generation who remember the time during the Civil War when the relations between this country and England, this country and France, this country and Germany, were strained; when we felt that we were constantly living under the shadow of their interference in our affairs; when the greatest service that could be rendered was to persuade them to keep their hands off; and the feeling in this country against those nations was extremely bitter. But to-day Japan certainly wishes to coöperate with us, and she recognizes the friendship that we have shown her in the recent war with Russia. Russia would be anxious to be our friend if possible, and a reformed Russia will find us warmly her friend. Germany has shown her desire to be friendly with us by her recent action about the tariff. France and England are certainly each anxious to preserve their present relations with us; and if this country were to ask them simply to make this agreement, I am perfectly certain that there would be no objection. If we said that we wanted this thing we should get it.

A citation may well be made from an able address delivered by the Hon. Albert E. Pillsbury, formerly attorney-general of Massachusetts, at a meeting held in Faneuil Hall, Boston, a few years ago, to discuss the subject of the neutralization of the Philippine Islands:—

The proposed neutralization means that the United States shall invite the principal powers to join with it in a treaty agreement, setting the islands apart from conquest and binding the inhabitants to abstain from offensive warfare, with a recognition and, if the usual practice is followed, a guaranty by the contracting powers of their independence whenever conceded by the United States. In short, neutralization means that the islands shall not molest nor be molested by any other power, and that the nations will recognize and protect their independence whenever they are made independent.

... The great merit of neutralization, appealing alike to people of all views upon the Philippine policy, is that it clears the path of the most formidable difficulties in the way of working out, to whatever result, the problem that confronts us there. Some advantages at once to be gained by it are apparent at a glance. It permanently removes the islands from the theater of war;—a sufficient end in itself, if there were no other. It thus relieves the United States from maintaining a great naval and military establishment in order to be prepared at all times for their defense. It avoids the first and chief objection always urged against independence—that, if given their freedom, the islands will at once fall a prey to some foreign power or powers.

Public opinion as expressed to-day in Congress is supporting the declaration long ago made by executive officials of the United States of our purpose to prepare the Filipinos for self-government and entire independence. When that preparation is accomplished, neutraliza-

tion of the territory of the people to be enfranchised would seem to be only a proper complement to the grant of self-government and independence, and might be necessary indeed to make it effective.

Here is a reasonable and practicable method of availing ourselves of existing conditions, unlike many peace proposals which design plans for a beautiful machinery whose working presupposes a converted world and a sublimely elevated public opinion. Reformers may be in the best sense opportunists. The peace movement need not scruple to avail itself of the jealousy of the nations concerning territory which each anxiously covets, yet each perhaps still more anxiously desires to keep from others, by persistently urging that they should agree to leave it to itself under the *ægis* of a joint guaranty. How impressive would be the example of the prosperity and progress of the Philippines and their people, benefiting by the advantages which the civilization of the more advanced nations would offer in exchange for the opportunities freely furnished for the development of native resources by foreign capital and commercial exchanges,—opportunities sought in generous competition by the world! Freed from the burdens of a military establishment and favored by the security of a guaranteed and lasting peace, the islands would be irresistible object-lessons, and effect in a generation more than the eloquence of the idealist is likely to effect in centuries of pleading for the general and voluntary abrogation of this element of sovereignty among the great powers. Why should not the United States, in setting the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent, use its good offices to negotiate a treaty with the other great powers, adding the islands to the list of those fortunate countries that are forever freed from the peril of foreign war and foreign conquest?

Whether the next step toward neutralization comes from the initiation of a great power like the United States or eventuates from the counsels of some general conference called for the adjustment of the territorial problems which arise at the conclusion of great wars, the event would be hailed with enthusiasm by all sincere lovers of peace everywhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

TO ACCOMPANY NEUTRALIZATION, BY ERVING WINSLOW.

Bonfils, Henry (*mise au courant par Paul Fauchille*).

Manuel de droit international public (droit des gens).

Chapter VI., Section V., Situation internationale des états et des territoires
neutralisés. pp. 211-220.

Paris: Arthur Rousseau, 1912. viii, 1121 pp. 8vo.

British and Foreign State Papers. 1835-1839. Vol. XXVII.

Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia and Russia on the
one part and the Netherlands on the other, relative to the Netherlands
and Belgium. Signed at London, April 19, 1839. Pp. 990-1002.

London: Printed by Harrison & Sons, 1856. xvi, 1433 pp. 8vo.

Calvo, Charles.

Le Droit international théorique et pratique. Tome IV.

État de neutralité, pp. 407-566.

Paris: Arthur Rousseau, 1896. xxviii. (1), 630 pp. 8vo.

Descamps, Éd[ouard].

*La neutralité de la Belgique au point de vue historique, diplomatique,
juridique et politique.*

Brussels: F. Larcier, 1902. (2) x, 639 pp. 8vo.

Dollet, René.

*Les origines de la neutralité de la Belgique et le système de la barrière
(1609-1830).*

Paris: Félix Alcan, 1902. xxv (1), 570 pp. Colored map. 8vo.

Hertslet, Edward, C.B.

*The Map of Europe by Treaty; Showing the Various Political and
Territorial Changes which have taken place since the General
Peace of 1814.*

Declaration of the powers on the affairs of the Helvetic confederacy. Signed
at Vienna, 20th March, 1815. Vol. 1, pp. 64-69.

Treaty relative to the separation of Belgium from Holland. Signed
at London, 15th November, 1831. Vol. 2, pp. 858-871.

Treaty relative to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and the Duchy
of Limburg. Signed at London, 11th May, 1867. Vol. 3, pp. 1801-1806.

Treaty on the part of the Netherlands. Signed at London, 19th
April, 1839. Vol. 2, pp. 979-998.

Le Grand duché de Luxembourg et le traité de Londres, May 11, 1867.

London: Butterworths, 1875. 3 vols. 8vo.

Hilty, Charles.

*Considérations actuelles sur la neutralité de la Suisse, traduit par
Mentha.*

Berne: 1889.

Kleen, Richard.

Lois et usages de la neutralité d'après le droit international, conventionnel et coutumier des états civilisés.

Paris: 1898-1900. 2 vols.

Lawrence, T. J.

The Principles of International Law.

The law of neutrality, pp. 587-732.

Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1910. xxi (1), 745 pp. 8vo.

Mazade, Ch. de.

L'Europe et les neutralités la Belgique et la Suisse.

Paris: Plon, 1893.

McCracken, W. D.

The Rise of the Swiss Republic. A History.

Boston: Arena Publishing Co., 1892. 413 pp. Colored map. 8vo.

Milovanovitch, [Milovan].

Les Traités de garantie au XIX^e siècle.

Paris: Arthur Rousseau, 1888. 415 pp. 8vo.

Nys, Ernest.

Études de droit international et de droit politique. Deuxième série.

Notes sur le neutralité, pp. 47-163.

Brussels: Alfred Castaigne, 1901. viii, 340 pp. 8vo.

Rogers, Henry Wade.

Address at Baltimore Peace Congress, 1911.

Schweizer, Paul.

Geschichte der schweizerischen Neutralität.

Frauenfeld: 1893-95.

Servais, E.

Le Grand duché de Luxembourg et le traité de Londres du 11 mai, 1867.

Paris: Plon, 1879. 190 pp. 8vo.

Thonissen, J. J.

La Neutralité belge dans le système européen.

In *Patria Belgica, encyclopédie nationale ou exposé méthodique de toutes les connaissances relatives à la Belgique*, deuxième partie, pp. 367-380.

Brussels: 1873. 4to.

Wheaton, Henry.

Elements of International Law. Fourth English edition.

London: Stevens & Sons, 1904. xxxv (1), 848 pp. 8vo.

Wicker, Cyrus French.

Neutralization.

London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1911.

World Peace Foundation
Pamphlet Series

**WILLIAM T. STEAD AND
HIS PEACE MESSAGE**

BY
JAMES A. MACDONALD

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

July, 1912, No. 6, Part III

Entered as second-class matter, April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

If a thousandth part of what has been expended in war and preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries past of its terrors, its sufferings, its impoverishment and its demoralization, but what was learned from history.—HORACE MANN.

*Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.—LONGFELLOW.*

WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE.

BY JAMES A. MACDONALD, MANAGING EDITOR OF THE
*TORONTO Globe.**

"We also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses!" With that inspiring challenge the Hebrew Christians of the olden time were urged to more patient endurance and more steadfast endeavor. They were encouraged to regard their little lives as the observed of those unseen observers, the saints and heroes who crowd the galleries of Hebrew history. A vivid sense of that alert and interested audience nerved them to more heroic effort. In that radiant presence of the glorified dead even the least of the living Hebrews could run his race with patience, and the most faint-hearted could fight the good fight of faith.

And may not we also, we men of this later day and this western world, have like faith to believe that in this hour of wonder and mystery the shining silence round about us may be crammed with our triumphant dead? If that be true, if the spirits of our departed friends do indeed watch with interest the affairs of human life, then I dare to think that pressing into the forefront of those cohorts about us, "the unuttered, the unseen, the alive, the aware," there is that rugged, strong, heroic soul whose purpose it was in this lower world to stand in this very place to-night and at this very hour to speak home to our hearts his message of "Universal Peace."

W. T. Stead looked forward to this hour. In his heart there burned a message to this Congress of the Men and Religion Movement of America. It was his hope that from this place a line of power would go out into all the world. A whole lifetime of thought and effort and passionate pleading would have gathered itself up into one appeal for international good will and the world's peace.

* Address at Carnegie Hall, New York, Sunday evening, April 21, 1912. This was the Sunday following the sinking of the "Titanic," on which Mr. Stead was coming to New York to speak at this meeting upon the World's Peace, in connection with the Men and Religion Movement; and Dr. Macdonald took his place at the time when he would have spoken.

that the nation makes progress through the survival of the fittest. Sir, in war the law of progress through selection and survival is reversed. The fittest do not survive. In the competitions of peace the weak, the cowardly, the unfit, go to the wall, but in the fierce testing of men on the march and on the battlefield it is the strong, the daring, the courageous, who fall. War's insatiable call has ever been, "Send us the best ye breed." None but the best, the virile, the self-sacrificing, will face the perils and endure the hardness for a great cause. The best go first. The best stand in the forefront. The best are first to fall. The fittest do not survive.

And, if nations rise by the survival of the fittest, so by the same inexorable law there comes national reaction and decay, when the fittest are destroyed and the parentage of the nation is left to the inferior and the unfit. The law works both ways. If it is a ladder by which the nation may climb to higher levels of physical fitness and moral character, by that same ladder the nation may sink to lower grades. If the science of eugenics means anything, it warns against the degeneration which results from the dominance of the defective, the cowardly and the self-seeking. And all history gives point and emphasis to that warning.

Many causes conspired to the decay and destruction of the nations of antiquity, but one abiding and persistent cause was the continual and relentless wars whose records make up almost all there is of ancient history. It was so with Assyria and Egypt, with Persia, with Greece and with Rome. In the days of Rome's imperialism the Roman eagles flew over all the world and Roman law blazed the way for civilization. But the wars of the Cæsars were the slaughter-time of Rome's choicest sons. The Roman legions drew off the picked men of Roman citizenship. The strong, the daring, the heroic were foremost in the fight and soonest to fall. The conscription gathered for the slaughter all the fit, and left behind only the weaklings, the stall-boys, the slaves to father the next generation of Roman citizens. From that blood came not statesmen and generals and intrepid heroes, but, as history records, "fops and dandies." There was a new Rome,—a Rome in which the blood of old Roman mothers and of weak and coward fathers bred a race given over to luxury and the vices that destroy. The decline and fall of the empire was inevitable. Blood tells.

So with France. Nor even to this day has France recovered from the awful loss of her best blood in the Napoleonic wars. The best

were taken from mid-life, then from old age, then from youth. "A boy can stop a bullet of the Russian as well as a man," said Napoleon, and all the way to Moscow the flower of France was strewn and withered before it came to seed. In that loss France found no gain to match.

And what says the history of Britain? Every part of the United Kingdom tells the same story. From every parish the choicest sons, generation after generation, went out to war. Sons of the palace and sons of the manse, sons of the castle and sons of the cottage, out they went, the best the nation bred, and only the shattered remnants ever came back. Every village has its monument. In every great cathedral and in every parish church you may read in marble and brass the telltale lists of officers and men. Worse it was than the Egyptian sacrifice of the first-born, for war is no respecter of persons. What wonder that England has suffered loss! What wonder that the city slum fills up with the human dregs, and that through the villages disease from the barracks and Indian camp life leaves behind the white-faced, the hopeless, the unfit!

The toll taken from Ireland and from Scotland was not less wasting than from England. Every valley, every moor, every hamlet, every mountain glen,—they all sent of their best, and their best never came back. In the Highland shires and islands of Scotland the loss was perhaps worst and most wasteful of all. Life there was rugged and hard. The weaklings died in infancy, and through the survival of the fittest there was bred their race of kilted giants. The Union Jack flies over no spot of earth that matched with its soldiers the Isle of Skye. No regiments ever brought greater glory to the flag or died more daringly for its honor than did the Scottish regiments in the kilted tartan. But at what a price, not to themselves alone, but to Scotland! The tragedy of the Celts is in this sentence: "Forever they went out to battle and forever they fell." The Grants stained the marble palaces of India vermilion with their blood and saved the honor of the race in the awful hour of the Mutiny, but few of their clan are left in "their ain dear glen." The "Cameron's Gathering," that rose wild and high on the march to Waterloo, would summon few of the Highland host to-day through the snows of Lochaber. No Chisholms are left in Strathglen. The Mackenzies are few at Lochbroom. In the gloaming glens of the West Highlands is a silence deep as death, where once a thousand men would start up in a night at the call of Argyll. No Lord of the Isles who sleeps at

Iona could ever again gather a clan worthy his tartan, though he blew all night in the pibroch of Donald. From the days after Cul-loden on every battlefield where Saint George's banners flew the Scottish war-pipes sounded shrill and clear, and the reddest blood of Scotland was poured out without stint. But at what a cost!

And the cost was not alone in the death of so many brave men who fell, but that those heroes in their youth and their prime left no breed behind. The heroic sires died with heroic sons unbred in their lives. It is the countless heroes who ought to have been, but are not,—that never-ending phantom host who had no chance at life,—had they taken the places left empty by the fall of their sires, the loss had not been so far beyond repair.

In vain does Kipling try to reconcile us to Britain's irreparable loss by glorifying the lavish abandon of the sacrifices she made:—

“We have strawed our best to the weed's unrest,
To the shark and the sheering gull.
If blood be the price of Admiralty,
Lord God, we've paid in full.”

Paid in full! And the waste and burden of that toll is the nation's tragedy to-day. The blood that went to sharks and gulls might have been the seed of the Greater Britain.

And what of these United States? What has been war's loss to this Republic? Its financial burden is heavy enough. For a young and peaceful nation to spend more than sixty-seven per cent. of its entire annual federal revenue on armaments and war debts is surely an appalling situation. But what about your loss in manhood, in moral fiber, in genuine patriotism?

I put this question to you thoughtful Americans, as I put it to your President and to members of his Executive Council: How comes it that this young Republic, born for freedom, consecrated anew to government of the people, by the people and for the people, is at this moment threatened in the very citadel of its democracy, and menaced not by foes from without, but by organized treason and selfishness and graft within? How comes it? Has it any relation to the fact that a generation and a half ago in your one great war more than 600,000 men of the North and more than 400,000 of the South, the youth and strength and hope of both North and South, died on the altar of heroic patriotism and left no breed behind? Perhaps the sacrifice was necessary, and perhaps not; but at what a price!

Dare you even yet face with open eyes the human loss in that one war? The loss to the North is beyond measure. Old men from Massachusetts weep when they recall the lads in their tens and twenties, the thousands of them, who marched out with them and never came back. To take the seasoned soldiers and the men past their prime were loss enough, but yours was the slaughter of the innocents in the bloom of their young manhood. And in them were slaughtered, too, the sons of their heroism who ought to have been with us to-day, but who never were born.

Why should men ask: Where are the hundred orators of Boston? Where are the successors of the patriots and statesmen, of the philosophers and poets, of the leaders of thought and men of vision who a generation ago shed the effulgence of New England over all the land? Where are they? The names of some of them are on the tablets in the Memorial Hall of Harvard University or on the other record tablets of your heroic dead, and an uncounted host who ought to have been here were never named at any baptismal font.

Not New England alone, but all the North, from Maine across Illinois to the Pacific, they came, "three hundred thousand more," and they consecrated in your memories the names of the Potomac and of the James and of the Cumberland and of the Tennessee and of the Rio Grande.

And if the North paid her full measure of devotion, by that same overflowing measure also paid the South. If New England filled her measure with blood of the Puritan red, Virginia, in her chivalry, poured out a blood as noble as ever coursed in England's veins, and North Carolina the blood she drew from the strong heart of the Scottish Highlands, and Kentucky her Scottish-Irish blood, and every other Southern State sent the best she bred.

The other day I stood on the road over which Sherman marched through North Carolina, leaving behind a trail, not only of sorrow and loss, but of bitterness, which a half-century has not eradicated. This was the proud, sad boast of those North Carolinians; in whose veins is the blood of the Scottish Celt as untainted as my own: "With only 115,000 voters in the State, we sent 128,000 soldiers, the flower of our men and boys, into the war, and on the fateful day at Gettysburg North Carolina drove the wedge of gray farthest into the ranks of blue, and left more dead behind than any other Southern State had, all told, on the field." A sad, proud boast, indeed; but who can measure that irreparable human loss!

And the full tale of your wages, North and South, was that, while your heroes and patriots fell in their youth, the bounty-jumpers and the skeddaddlers, the self-seeking and the mercenary, the men who played politics with others' lives and the men who made fortunes out of war business,—they all lived and flourished and reproduced their ilk to breed your grafters and bosses and bloated plutocrats of to-day.*

But Mr. Stead would have done more than assail us with the staggering facts of war. He would also have heartened us with the confident tokens of peace. And what are the signs on the horizon that tell of the coming day?

For one thing there is not only death to that old notion of the Divine right of militarism, but there is also the turning of the search-light on the activities of private Special Interests whose dividends depend on the expenditures of public money for military and naval expansion. It was bad enough when men talked of war as "the sudden making of splendid names," and the large opportunity for the promotion of subordinate officers. But it is infinitely worse, infinitely more sordid, infinitely more dangerous, when huge private corporations composed of stockholders influential in Parliament, in the press, and in social life, and commanding enormous wealth, rely for their business profits and their dividends almost wholly on government contracts awarded for battleships, artillery, and armaments. An illuminating and significant statement was made in the "Financial Survey" of the *Toronto Globe* last New Year's day by Mr. F. W. Hirst, editor of the *London Economist*. That competent and capable critic and publicist, in explaining the alarming increase in the income tax and death duties in three years, said: "If our military and naval expenditure had remained stationary, I do not think either the income tax (which nearly trebled) or the death duties need have been higher now than they were in 1908; but that would not have suited the armor-plate press."

"The armor-plate press!" There you have the ghastliest danger at this moment threatening Great Britain, the war nations of Europe, the United States, and even Japan. Mr. Hirst says, commenting on "the seriousness of naval competition," that in Britain alone "during the last three years our naval expenditure has risen by £12,000,000." But anything less "would not have suited the armor-plate press"!

But the note of hope is in the fact that the people are beginning

*See "The Blood of the Nation," by Dr. David Starr Jordan, published by the World Peace Foundation.

to ask about the special interests and private syndicates back of the armor-plate press. In Britain there are six armament companies, representing in share and debenture capital £28,000,000, whose profits year by year would be wiped out by restriction in building of armaments by British or foreign governments. The lists of shareholders in three of those companies have been scrutinized, and are found to include names of an astonishing number of dukes, marquises, earls, barons, baronets, knights, members of Parliament, military and naval officers, financiers, journalists and newspaper proprietors. There you have the power behind "the armor-plate press." Every noble order, every social influence, every effective agency of public discussion and of popular agitation, is seen to be directly and financially interested in keeping high the military and naval expenditures. And those expenditures are voted by Parliament under pressure. Back of that pressure are the "war scares" of the "armor-plate press." And back of the "armor-plate press" are the armament syndicates. Russia is worse than Britain. Germany is no better. Are there no war syndicates with their "armor-plate press" in America? Are there no beginnings in Canada? We need another Stead to make us hate him for telling us the truth. When the ugly truth is out, the war scares will cease to terrify, and the full blood profits of the war syndicates will not be paid.*

A second heartening sign in which Mr. Stead rejoiced is the new standard of values as between the interests of the people and the pomp and glory of war. Stead was as true an imperialist as Britain knew. His imperialism was all the truer because of his supreme devotion to the common people, to the down-trodden and the distressed. What hurt him most, what hurts us all, is that the waste on war makes impossible adequate expenditures on the betterment of life for millions of the people. But there is a new standard of values. It is coming to be seen even in Parliament and in the halls of trade that the disgrace of government is not in the absence of military glory, but in the existence of social evils, in the haggardness of common poverty for the old and the hopelessness of life for the young. But a new note is struck. It was struck ringingly not long ago by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer. The words of Lloyd George, that new hope of the world's democracy, echoed round the world and quickened the pace of social progress. Here in this Congress, with the Union Jack of Britain on one side and the Stars and Stripes of

*See the pamphlet on "Syndicates for War," published by the World Peace Foundation.

the United States on the other, these words of the British Chancellor smite and burn: "The stain on the national flag is just as deep if that flag floats over slum-bred children and ill-paid, ill-fed, ill-housed men and women as if it were to droop in defeat on the field of war." When we men of America honor our two flags, when we twine them in token of English-speaking fraternity, let us also pledge ourselves to make these flags stand not for the waste and want of war, but for social justice, for social hope and for the redemption of life from the curse of Cain.

A third note of the morning of universal peace Stead found in the progress made by the idea of international arbitration. The most significant fact in international politics to-day is the fact—not the theory or the ideal, but the fact—of independent judicial arbitration as the recognized means of settling disputes between civilized peoples. War once was the rule: now war is the exception. Between the most highly civilized nations war is out of the question. Between nations of the Anglo-Saxon speech and tradition war is unthinkable. Arbitration already is the permanent fact between Britain and America. The treaty suggested by President Taft, responded to by Sir Edward Grey, upon which public opinion both in Britain and in America is more unanimous than on any other question, will yet be redeemed from the boggling and blundering of the United States Senate. Such a treaty will deliver the English-speaking world not only from the fact of war, but also from the fear of war. When that treaty, or one of even broader sweep, is made law for those two world powers, it will become law for France also. Japan will enter it. Germany will not long stay out. China, too, peaceful but most potential of them all, will keep with them the peace of the Orient. A sense of universal justice, with the nations "lapt in universal law," will mean the universal peace of which Stead would have spoken and which Tennyson foresaw:—

When the war-drum throbs no longer, and the battle-flags are furled
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

Stead believed the "Federation of the world" was no mere poetic fancy. He saw it in vision. It was his dream. But, though the vision tarrieth, it shall not fail. Dream though it be, it is dreamed by those who make their dreams come true. Already there is a stirring and a movement among the nations. Those of like traditions and like ideals are coming together. Federation of sovereign States

is going on. The German Zollverein has its world significance. Stead used to think that the American Republic presented to the world a model of the world organization of free States. He gloried in the "liberty and union" of these United States. Here he saw an illustration of the "Federation of the world." But, when I saw him, his eyes had swept an even wider circle. He saw not in the German Zollverein, not in this American Republic of sovereign States, but in his own British Empire, the truer and more meaningful suggestion of a world federation of free, sovereign, autonomous nations.

Sir, the British Empire is without precedent in history. It stands alone, unique, significant. It is not an empire of subject States. It is an alliance of free nations. Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa,—the five self-governing overseas dominions of Britain,—are each of them as free as the motherland itself. Each for itself makes its own laws, administers its own affairs, controls its own government, fixes its own tariffs and taxes against one another and against the world, and with absolute authority over its trade and commerce and immigration, asserts its freedom in Kipling's words:

"The gates are mine to open,
As the gates are mine to close."

And yet with all that freedom—a freedom larger than is enjoyed by any State in this American Republic—those overseas nations are bound inseparably about one central throne, swear allegiance to one sovereign king, and proudly float one common flag. President Taft spoke truly when he said that the bond which binds Canada to Britain is light and impalpable as air. Yes, light as the bonds of faith, impalpable as the ties of love, but stronger than cords of steel, surer than tariff or tax, and we who were bred overseas stand by the ancient home because we are sons of the blood and call her mother still.

That, sir, is the most marvelous thing, the unique, the unparalleled thing in world organization on the basis of peace and good-will. And, if that has been achieved, even greater things are possible. Possible is the English-speaking fraternity. Yes, the English-speaking fraternity! It is coming. In spirit it is here. These two flags, with their common colors, stand to-day for a common faith, a common purpose and a common life. On this continent these two flags float over an international boundary line, dividing sovereignty from sovereignty along 3,700 miles, but without a fort, without a battle-

ship, without a gun, without a soldier on parade. Across that boundary line for a hundred years nation has not lifted up sword against nation. And who knows but before another hundred years are gone the example set by Britain and America on this continent will have been learned by Europe and by Asia? The nations are tired, tired and sick, of their own mad and barbarous folly. When they have seen with open eyes what has been done by two proud peoples on this continent,—a thousand miles up a great river, a thousand miles along inland seas, a thousand miles across open prairie, a thousand miles over mountain ranges, and never a gun or a guard,—when they have seen that unmatched witness to peace, they will hang the trumpet in the hall and study war no more.

And that day of universal peace is coming. It is nearer than many of us suppose. The crowding of the world nations into one world neighborhood makes it needful. The progress of civilization makes it possible. The triumph of Christianity makes it sure. It is brought nearer by every victory of intelligence over ignorance, of law over force, of love over hate. It is helped forward by every heroism of peace, by every sacrifice of self, by every martyrdom to the cause of liberty and truth. Democracy calls to it, for only in the day of peace can the people reign supreme. The Prince of Peace was first to blaze the way for good will to the world of men. And in His train followed bravely the great prophet of the dawn, whose name we speak with reverence, William Thomas Stead, that soldier-saint, "who never turned his back, but marched breast forward," whose going from the martyr-deck of the "Titanic" was not to the mournful dirge of the Dead March, but to the triumph song of the "Hallelujah Chorus." He who meant to speak to us his word for universal peace entered gloriously the unseen holy, and is one more familiar face in that compassing cloud of witnesses whose radiant presence overshadows us to-night.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29a Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

-
- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOL. Postpaid, 10 cents
A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

International School of Peace

**EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL
FRIENDSHIP**

BY

LUCIA AMES MEAD

INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF PEACE

29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

1910

If a thousandth part of what has been expended in war and preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries past of its terrors, its sufferings, its impoverishment, and its demoralization, but what was learned from history.—HORACE MANN.

*Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.—LONGFELLOW.*

EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP.

BY LUCIA AMES MEAD.

How to attain peace between nations is a problem not to be settled by Dreadnoughts, but by psychology. As a man thinketh, so is he. If he has delirium tremens and thinks himself threatened by rattlesnakes, he acts accordingly. If he has been under the influence of the 727 active and retired officers of the army and navy in Washington who, in the words of Justice Brewer, "are gradually transforming the capital of the country into a military or naval centre," he will doubtless share their point of view and see a possible enemy in nations with which we have always been at peace. Nothing is so important as that men shall think right, and especially that the rising generation shall be well instructed upon the momentous international issues of our new time. Happily, within the past few years several very encouraging educational movements have been initiated in the United States, which give promise of creating a different psychology in the citizen of the future as regards the whole question of national dangers and national defence. It is the purpose of this paper to give an account of some of these movements.

The American School Peace League held its first annual meeting at Denver in July, 1909, in connection with the convention of the National Educational Association. At the annual business meeting of the latter association, which represents the educators of the country, resolutions were

passed unanimously and earnestly indorsing the League, and urging all teachers to co-operate with it.

The origin of this splendidly organized association was most interesting. When the first American National Peace Congress met at Carnegie Hall, New York, in April, 1907, one of the public school teachers, Miss Mary J. Pierson, who had arranged a great children's meeting in New York in connection with the International Peace Congress of 1904, took the initiative for a greater meeting in connection with this Congress. By selling the boxes in Carnegie Hall to private schools, the expenses were practically covered. Under the chairmanship of Superintendent Maxwell, between four and five thousand pupils, with some delegates from neighboring cities, crowded the hall, and listened with delight to music from a chorus of five hundred voices and to addresses from Baron D'Estournelles de Constant and other speakers from home and abroad. The enthusiasm with which the boys and girls entered into the spirit of the occasion was so impressive that it seemed imperative it should not be permitted to dissipate. A committee was appointed to provide for a continuance of the work so well begun. Mr. Carnegie, who was the president of the Congress, offered \$1,000 a year for ten years, provided this sum was doubled. This was accomplished, and the American School Peace League began its work in 1908, with Superintendent Van Sickle, of Baltimore, as president and a long list of eminent educators on its council and committees. The work of organization was accomplished by the League's able secretary, Mrs. Fanny Fern Andrews, of Boston.¹ Its committees on history, on publication, on meetings and discussion, on the press, and on international relations represent nearly every State in the Union. Prizes aggregating \$300 have been offered for the three best essays presented

¹ Address, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston.

by seniors in normal and preparatory schools on such subjects as "The United States, the Exemplar of an Organized World," and "The History of International Arbitration."

The purpose of the League is "to promote through the schools and the educational public of America the interests of international justice and fraternity." It works through the teachers rather than directly with pupils. It aims to supplement the normal school training so as to prepare future teachers to give instruction in history, patriotism, literature, and geography from the point of view necessitated by new world-conditions. It aims to color the teacher's thought rather than to impose new burdens on the already overcrowded curriculum and to demand time for specific peace instruction. Only on May 18—Peace Day—will it ask that an hour or two be set aside to teach the new history of arbitration, not yet incorporated in text-books, and to discuss other substitutes for war. Specialists are now at work preparing material for use on these occasions. The International School of Peace will publish various valuable works. The rapid growth of a spectacular patriotism which concerns itself chiefly with what President Woodrow Wilson has called "genuflections before the flag," and puts the emphasis upon externals to the exclusion of what is vital, has of late been marked. The aim of the League is to modify this so as to deepen the spirit of service of country as against mere pride of country, and to show that service of country is chiefly needed to fight the constant foes within our midst rather than the external foes who, in our history of 120 years, have slaughtered altogether in our three foreign wars less than one-tenth the number slain every year by the one preventable disease of tuberculosis. In addition to work in normal schools, the League aims to supply speakers to teachers' conventions and to enroll without fee the great body of teachers who appreciate its purpose and desire literature on the subject.

It will also endeavor to have adequate literature on the subject placed in public libraries, and as soon as possible will seek to enlist other countries in similar national leagues. A Southern branch has been formed, with Professor P. P. Claxton, of Knoxville, Tenn., as president, and fourteen state branches with corresponding committees have been formed. The resources of the League were much increased during the last year. Mr. Ginn, the founder of the International School of Peace, contributed \$1,000, and Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, another public-spirited citizen of Massachusetts, gave \$5,000. But, to reach adequately the five hundred thousand teachers of the country, an annual income is required of \$25,000,—less than the annual repairs on two torpedo boats.

The League, judging from its first year of splendid activity, promises to be one of the most influential organizations in America or in the world for the promotion of international good will. It will make no extravagant claims. It will teach the child to honor the men who fought for their country's independence and union; but it will make a clear distinction between past wars, many of which were inevitable, and future wars, which, with our present legal substitutes for war, will be criminal. It will show the difference between civil war, lynching, and riots, which may possibly occur for an indefinite time, and international war, which, without any change of human nature, can be ended soon. It will teach both teacher and pupil the significance of Garrison's words, "My countrymen are all mankind," and, without asking a moment more of school time, will accomplish its results by giving a different tone and emphasis to a large part of the school work.

At the Mohonk Conference of 1905 Dr. Daniel C. Gilman initiated a movement for the introduction of peace propaganda into colleges and universities. He affirmed that "the opinions brought out there at the Mohonk Conference

are those that ought to be carried by an organized effort into all the colleges and universities of the land. "If," he said, "you can get one-tenth of the enthusiasm that the young men bestow upon the athletic field directed to the study of these great international questions, the victory is ours. I would have the educated young men and women of our country grow up breathing the air of international arbitration as freely and as naturally as they do the air that supports their life." As a result of Dr. Gilman's suggestion, a committee on colleges and universities was appointed, of which Pres. Benj. Ide Wheeler, Pres. E. A. Alderman, Pres. James B. Angell, Hon. Seth Low, Pres. L. Clark Seelye, and Hon. Andrew D. White are members. The correspondence with colleges has been carried on by the corresponding secretary of the Conference, Mr. H. C. Phillips, of Mohonk. This committee has incited about 250 colleges and universities to the commemoration of Peace Day,—May 18,—to the giving of special lectures on the peace movement, or to arrangements for debates or contests of various kinds, prizes having been offered in some colleges. Hon. Andrew D. White, in submitting the report in 1909, called attention to the special donation by Mr. John R. Lindgren, of Chicago, of \$25,000 to be spent in North-western University in educational work to promote international peace; also to the publication by the Carnegie Institution of Research at Washington of a series of the great classics of international law, which, when complete, are to be placed in the library of each important college and university in the United States. Said the honored speaker. "We want to work this idea of arbitration into the very warp and woof of American thought; and there is no better way than through the colleges and universities of the land." His recommendation was that a lecturer be provided to give special addresses on the subject in various institutions.

In connection with this Mohonk college work an annual

prize of \$100 has latterly been offered, provided by a Harvard student, Mr. Pugsley, for the best essay on International Arbitration by an undergraduate student of any American college or university. Many essays have been written in the competition; and the admirable essay by a student of Johns Hopkins, awarded in 1909, is printed in the Mohonk report of that year. This year the prize essayist was a Harvard student. One remembers in this connection that Charles Sumner bequeathed \$1,000 to Harvard for an annual prize there for the best essay on Universal Peace.

The Intercollegiate Peace Association, due to the initiative of President Byers of Goshen College and Professor Russell of Earlham College, both of Indiana, is a body composed of representatives of about seventy colleges and universities of the Middle West "united for the promotion of organized activities among the students and educators in support of the International Arbitration and Peace Movement." Beginning with an enrollment of eight colleges and universities in 1905, it has developed year by year in the States of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and it hopes eventually to enroll the colleges and universities of all the States. The main work of the Association is in intercollegiate and interstate oratorical contests for prizes upon subjects which bear upon some phase of the question of international peace. At the National Peace Congress held in Chicago in May, 1909, one session, presided over by Dean Vincent of Chicago University, was devoted to the third annual interstate Intercollegiate Oratorical Contest. The judges included such well-known persons as President David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University and Miss Jane Addams. Five representatives of as many colleges contested, their subjects being "The Significance of a Permanent Peace Congress," "The Evolution of World Peace," "Justice and Peace," "Interna-

tional Arbitration and Peace," and "America, the Exemplar of Peace." The prizes offered were \$75 and \$50, respectively, for first and second prizes. The contestants impressed their audience with the fact that they were not debating for or against a proposition which they might or might not believe, but that they were expressing their profound conviction. Between \$700 and \$800 was offered in 1909 for prizes alone in the preliminary and final contests. In 1907 over \$2,000 was raised for carrying on the work. Many students who have contested in recent years have become permanently interested in a subject hitherto new to them, and some of them would gladly devote their lives to the peace cause at pecuniary sacrifice, were the way open to them. Here is a field to be peculiarly commended to the attention of the wealthy friends of the peace cause. With larger funds for prizes and paid secretarial service, this organization would soon win the co-operation of every college and university in the land, and would yearly gain hundreds as permanent advocates of the system which substitutes law for war. Its devoted secretary, Mr. George Fulk,¹ has given much unpaid service to the promotion of this work. In 1907 he carried to the Second Hague Conference a memorial representing over 22,000 students and over 1,600 professors. He visited students in several of the principal European universities, as a result of which negotiations were entered into later for the alliance between the Corda Fratres of Europe and the Cosmopolitan Clubs of the United States.

A movement of great promise is that of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, which, from a little club of eighteen students in 1903, has developed to a powerful body of over two thousand young men, representing almost sixty different countries, in 1910. Its modest beginning was in the apartments of a

¹ Address, Cerro Gordo, Ill.

young Japanese student in the University of Wisconsin, where was founded an International Club composed of sixteen foreign and two native students. Although clubs composed of foreigners of some one nationality were previously common, the idea of a club in which all foreign students should intermingle was new, and at first excited scepticism as to its success. But as a result of the attempt, born of faith and good will, the club of eighteen has grown to eighty-five, representing twenty countries. The contagion of faith and good will has now spread to nearly thirty colleges and universities. In 1907 a National Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs was formed. Its illustrated annuals are a revelation of a mighty power for international fraternity within our midst. As one studies in detail the faces of these picked men, future leaders of science and politics in China, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, India, the Philippines, South Africa, and other lands, as well as the frank, alert faces of our native collegians, one realizes that this club, like the similar ones elsewhere, is a melting-pot for whatever prejudice, suspicion, and indifference may have once lurked in them. To-day these men from all quarters of the globe, by the common bond of intellectual interests and common recreation, are coming, without any loss of patriotism as concerns their native lands, to think of themselves first of all as citizens of the world,—members of the brotherhood of man. "Above all nations is humanity," the striking utterance of Goldwin Smith, is the motto of the club, well chosen and far-reaching in its influence upon other clubs of narrow limitations. President Eliot has declared that the Harvard Cosmopolitan Club is the most interesting in the university. This numbers over two hundred members. One of the most successful chapters, that at Cornell, has begun the erection of a beautiful building, which will cost \$30,000 and will admirably house the representatives of over twenty nations who meet in cordial good fellowship

in its Cosmopolitan Club. A prominent member, who expects to study in Germany in 1910-11, is carefully planning to use his utmost endeavor to transplant the Cosmopolitan Club movement into the university which he is to enter there. As a rule, only one-third or one-half of the membership can be American, but there is a desire to increase this proportion, as foreigners chiefly seek acquaintance with Americans. The latter are selected from those students who have sympathy with foreigners, and these have shown themselves careful not to take too many offices nor use undue influence. For the most part, the foreign students are exceedingly brainy and courteous men, more interested in professional work than in amusement,—in short, picked men, whose future influence is sure to be great, especially when they come from the Orient.

At this moment, when hundreds of millions beyond the Pacific are awakening to the significance of western science, with the new hope of throwing off the burden of poverty, of developing national resources and achieving representative government in the near future, the impressions which these thoughtful youths carry back to convey to their compatriots become a matter of world importance. What they gain by hard labor in laboratory and class-room is of even less importance than what they acquire by daily contact with our American life. That they should be presented the best aspects of it, that they should make warm friendship with Americans, and carry home a conviction that this nation stands for justice and peace and good will, is a matter of national importance. It is incumbent not only on the American members of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, but on churches and other associations, to see that special courtesies and hospitality are offered to these quiet, keen observers, sent here now from China in increasing numbers by the fund returned from the Boxer indemnity. Mr. Guok-tsai Chao, of Shanghai, of the University of Wisconsin, thus

gives his reason for choosing that institution: "The ignorance of China on the part of Americans has been the cause of numerous deplorable misunderstandings and is the result of lack of intercourse between the two peoples. To remedy this situation, nothing can be better than for the Chinese students to mingle with the Americans, and let them learn from the living representatives instead of from the colored tales of China. Thus, when I learned there were very few Chinese students in Madison, I came."

It is interesting to observe that from this university its baseball team was sent to Japan in August, 1909, to play a series of ten games with the Keio university team. It was royally entertained, and served as one little link to bind together in sympathy the two nations whose friendship will be one of their strongest assets.

The meetings of the clubs sometimes are for lectures, but are largely social, with musical and dramatic features supplied in turn by each nationality. The flags of all the nations represented decorate the walls, and curios are presented and quaint customs and dances are illustrated from time to time. Here a Russian Jew in an engineering course sits beside a Japanese in the course in political economy, both listening to a Filipino band playing native airs, or to a North American talking football or politics, or a South American discussing coffee-raising or Bolivar. Each is for the time emancipated from self-consciousness and the limitations of his race and native district, and in turn is teacher and pupil of his fellows. Whether one is Jewish or Buddhist matters little, if he only shows himself a "jolly good fellow."

In order to correct erroneous impressions in their native lands concerning America, many members have pledged themselves to give accounts in their native papers and periodicals of American life and its educational privileges. "There never was a more loyal son of an alma mater than the foreign student," says Louis P. Lochner of the University of

Wisconsin, himself a prime mover in the Cosmopolitan Club movement. "They cannot help but carry home with them the message of peace on earth, good will to men." Mr. Lochner edits the *Cosmopolitan Student*, the new monthly organ of the clubs, and is the general secretary of the association.¹

The Cosmopolitan Club leaders have been of great service to the body of European students banded together for somewhat similar purposes, known as the "Corda Fratres." At the last biennial meeting of the latter society, held at The Hague in August, 1909, representatives of our Cosmopolitan Clubs, at a critical period in the history of Corda Fratres, when two elements were discordant, were asked to act as umpires, and succeeded so admirably that the society took a new lease of life. Its central bureau is to remain no longer in the hands of one nationality, but must be moved about. In 1911 the Bureau will come to America. This International Federation of Students, whose motto, "Corda Fratres," gives it its title, was founded at Turin in 1898, but not very successfully organized until September, 1905, at Liege, Belgium. At first the Federation had been divided into national sections, but last year it was reorganized so as to discard national lines and to form self-governing local associations as the units of the Federation. This has sixty-three local chapters, with fifteen thousand members of various European universities, though few, if any, in Germany and England. With the accession of forty thousand French students and our Cosmopolitan Clubs, their numbers nearly tripled in 1909. The principal object of the International Federation of Students is "to protect and promote the idea of solidarity and fraternity among students." Any student, regardless of his political or religious ideas, has a right to become a mem-

¹ Address, Madison, Wis.

ber, if he is registered in an institution of higher learning. Each member pledges himself to promote the spirit of international union among the youth and to try to "dissipate the prejudices and hatred which render states reciprocally hostile and always on a war footing," and to promote the work of peace and arbitration between nations. It is also the object of the Federation "to put in correspondence the students themselves," and to "ensure reciprocally hosts and friends in the large cities upon the occasion of travel." The official language of the Federation is French, together with the language of the country where the Congress is held. International congresses are held once in two years. Austrians, Italians, and French have hitherto been most in evidence in the work of the Federation. No practical results have as yet been achieved which equal those of the American Cosmopolitan Clubs. With the co-operation now of this able body on this side of the Atlantic and with the eloquent Mr. Pierre Julien as president,¹ it gives promise of great usefulness. Its executive committee has representatives from France, Italy, Hungary, Holland, Sweden, the United States, and South America. Every second term an American will be awarded the international presidency.

Another European movement just in embryo promises large results. At the initiative of a student at Kiel University, who has taken a leading part in the body in the German universities known as the *Freiestudentenschaft*, a movement has been set on foot to arrange an interchange of visits between German and English students, beginning with a visit of German students to England in the summer of 1910, to be followed the next summer by a visit of English students to Germany. The *Freiestudentenschaft* organization was founded ten years ago by Professor Harms of Kiel University. It has now thirty-seven chapters, includ-

¹ Address, 15 Rue de la Bucheris, Paris.

ing those in technical high schools as well as universities. The organization supplies the social need of many in that half of the whole student body which is outside the regular "corps,"—the organizations celebrated for their social functions and duelling. Among these students are the more scholarly and liberal-minded, who eschew the dissipations of the corps life. Among these, if anywhere in the German universities, may one find those who can be approached in the interest of international friendship. Many of these thoughtful young men's ideals are affected by the present collision between the monarchical and socialistic extremists. Nothing could be better for these young chemists, engineers, and philologists than to spend three months breathing the free air of England and seeing how the people are not kept helplessly in the dark as to the plans and policies of their government and how they play the master with their elected servants. A centre having been established in London, each German student will have the companionship of some English student in his own particular field of study, and they will make examinations of factories or cathedrals or mines, as the case may be, and pursue their study and research together. Who can doubt that this friendly companionship for a summer will go far to open the eyes of both to the immense field of interest which they have in common? And when the English students later, in turn, leave smoky London with its square miles of squalor for the clean and splendid capital of Germany, and spend a month without ever seeing a drunken beggar, as they study the order, thrift, and energy of the marvellous German people, will they not be learning lessons more important than any which their laboratories can teach? Though no word be exchanged about peace or arbitration, the preliminary steps to these will have been taken when the youth who are perhaps the future leaders of two empires have come to an understanding. The infrequency with which English students study in Ger-

many, as compared with the Scotch, doubtless has some connection with the fact that the humiliating fear of German invasion, which rose to a positive panic in 1909, has chiefly marked southern England and been laughed at north of Berwick-on-Tweed as "a fit of the English sillies." Profound misconception of their own race upon the other side of the North Sea and general ignorance of their language, together with the fatal refusal to agree with Germany and the United States, at the Second Hague Conference, to the inviolability of private property at sea in time of war, are compelling Great Britain, and through her the world, to maintain the burden of armaments which is staggering civilization.

The annual interchange of professorships between the Universities of Berlin and Harvard and Columbia, instituted on Germany's side by Emperor William, have already produced a noticeable impression and accentuated good feeling and mutual respect. Professor Felix Adler, on his return from his lectures on the Roosevelt foundation in Berlin, said: "Even among the educated classes of one country it is astounding how little real knowledge there is of the deeper life of their neighbors, of their tendencies, their aspirations, of what may be called their genius. Here are the great civilized peoples living side by side, and yet ignorant of all that is deepest in each other's life. The academic mission on which I was sent was essentially in the interests of international peace. . . . The great peril that hangs over the civilized world to-day is the very destruction of our civilization in some general conflagration. In the long run the true safeguard is the removal of suspicion, the mitigation of mutual aversions that separate peoples, and the bringing them to a better understanding. I have never seen a set of men—and women, too—so eager as the German students, so eager and so just, on the whole. As long as I live, I shall not forget that lecture in the old University of Berlin, with

that throng of eager faces, that electric tension in the atmosphere, that challenge on their part, and that generous and large response."

Another movement known as the World's Student Christian Federation, though not ostensibly a peace movement, is destined to be of very great service in bringing together in brotherly fellowship much of the best of the student body of the world. The Federation, established in 1895, in Sweden, by a combination of five great intercollegiate Christian Associations of America, Great Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia, now includes 2,060 Associations, with a membership of 138,000 students and professors. These are grouped in eleven national or international Christian students' movements; but, counting the constituent movements, the Federation now comprises and unites twenty-one national Christian students' movements. Four years ago only two or three countries had paid secretaries giving their whole time to the work. Now there are nine countries having such workers. In 1908 eighty national or sectional conferences were held, with 13,000 delegates. Among these were the Volunteer Conventions at Nashville, Liverpool, Halle, and Capetown, the Social Problems Conference at Matlock, and, most noteworthy of all, the Conference at Tokyo. The total number of the official publications of the student movements is 720, an increase of 50 per cent. in the last few years. The number of periodicals is twenty-four, the latest additions being *Fede e Vita* of the Italian movement, the English edition of *China's Young Men*, and the *Student World*, a quarterly, published in New York City. Gifts from Americans have provided for more than a dozen hostels for Japanese students, many large gifts coming directly from missionary funds. Such donations as Mr. Kennedy's of one and a half million dollars to Robert College on the Bosphorus are destined indirectly to do enormous service in promoting international

friendship. The marked increase of interest in social questions in these Christian students' organizations indicates much study of racial peculiarities and international problems. This interest in social problems, says the general secretary, Mr. John R. Mott,¹ "bids fair to be one of the truest and greatest services rendered by the student movements to the world." The leaders welcome this new interest and are the prime movers in promoting it. It is expected of every secretary that he should have an international outlook. In South Africa the secretary has chiefly devoted himself to promoting good feeling between the races. Japanese student secretaries have had enormous influence in addressing student bodies in India. "The peace spirit is everywhere dominant in the student movement, and all are enjoined to go forth as apostles of unity." One familiar with the movement says: "Probably no single factor in our generation has really done more to promote international fellowship and kindly feeling. When it is remembered that its membership is composed almost exclusively of educated men, of those who are to be the leaders of the new generation, the importance of this achievement is even more apparent."

While we survey the new educational movements, we must not forget the distinctly educational work carried on for years by the American Peace Society as a part of its regular activity. It took the initiative in promoting the observance of Peace Day in the schools of the country; its critical report on the text-books of history used in the schools did its part to hasten the salutary reform in that field now going on; and many of its publications are of great value to teachers.

The International School of Peace, founded by Edwin Ginn, the educational publisher, will, as its name implies,

¹ Address, 124 East 28th Street, New York City.

devote itself mainly to work of an educational character. It will co-operate with existing organizations doing educational work—Mr. Ginn has assisted liberally the School Peace League and the Cosmopolitan Club movement—and it will open new lines of work clearly needed. One of its regular departments will be devoted expressly to work in the schools and colleges. Its multiplying publications will serve other organizations as well as its own direct activities. Its International Library, begun several years ago and rapidly growing, already furnishes a considerable body of peace literature; and it has just begun the publication of a large series of pamphlets, many of which will be of peculiar value to teachers and the schools. It welcomes correspondence with teachers and every suggestion as to service which it may possibly render in the educational field.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF PEACE
BY GINN AND COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET, BOSTON

HALE—Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00

RALSTON—International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20

SCOTT—American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65

MEAD—The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents

SCOTT—The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20

HULL—The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65

WALSH—The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents

DODGE—War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents

BRIDGMAN—World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents

WARNER—The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents

CHANNING—Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

SUMNER—Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents

BLOCH—The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents

EVANS—Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40

Messrs. GINN AND COMPANY have also published for the International School of Peace the following works in pamphlet form

BETHINK YOURSELVES!—By LEO TOLSTOI. Postpaid, 10 cents

A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews—By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents

ORGANIZE THE WORLD—By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents

PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers—By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES

PACTS TO WHICH PAIRS OF NATIONS ARE
PARTIES WITH STATISTICS AND NOTES

COMPILED BY
DENYS P. MYERS

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

July, 1912, No. 6, Part V.

Entered as second-class matter, April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. See No. 6, Part V.
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD
Part IV. EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD.
Part V. REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS.

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

ARBITRATION TREATIES BETWEEN COUNTRIES

Corrected to July 1, 1912.

[The following chronological list of arbitration treaties includes only bipartite treaties, conventions or agreements, no effort being made to distinguish between documents technically different in respect to name.]

1899

Brazil—Chile. Signed at Rio de Janeiro, May 18; ratifications exchanged at Santiago, Chile, March 7, 1906; promulgated March 7, 1906, by Chile; text in 99 B. F. and S. P.,¹ 880, and N. R. G., 3 s., 1, 21, and 2, 124; effective ten years.

Argentina—Uruguay. Signed at Buenos Aires, July 8; ratifications exchanged at Buenos Aires, January 18, 1902; modifying protocol signed December 21, 1901; text in 94 B. F. and S. P., 525; effective ten years.

Argentina—Paraguay. Signed at Asunción, November 6; ratifications exchanged at Asunción, June 5, 1902; additional protocol signed January 25, 1902; text in 92 B. F. and S. P., 485; effective ten years.

1901

Bolivia—Peru. Signed at La Paz, November 21; see 1911.

1902

Mexico—Spain. Signed at Mexico City, January 11; ratifications exchanged at La Paz, April 13; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 407; effective ten years.

Spain—Uruguay. Signed at Mexico City, January 28; ratifications exchanged at Montevideo, November 21; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 410; effective ten years.

Salvador—Spain. Signed at Mexico City, January 28; ratifications exchanged at Guatemala City, September 28; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 409; effective ten years.

¹ B. F. and S. P. stands for *British and Foreign State Papers*; N. R. G. for *Nouveau Recueil Général de Traité*, III^e série; R. I. T. for *Recueil international de Traité de XX^e siècle*; For. Rel. for *Foreign Relations of the United States*; A. J. I. L. for *American Journal of International Law*.

San Domingo—Spain. Signed at Mexico City, January 28; ratifications exchanged at San Domingo, July 18; effective ten years.

Argentina—Spain. Signed January 28; see 1903.

Paraguay—Spain. Signed January 28.

Argentina—Bolivia. Signed at Buenos Aires, February 3; ratifications exchanged at Buenos Aires, January 27, 1903; modifying protocol signed July 19, 1902; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 399, and R. I. T., 1902, 151; effective ten years.

Colombia—Spain. Signed at Mexico City, February 17; ratifications exchanged at Bogotá, January 24, 1903; 95 B. F. and S. P., 404; effective ten years.

Bolivia—Spain. Signed at Mexico City, February 17; ratifications exchanged October 10, 1903; effective twelve years.

Guatemala—Spain. Signed at Mexico City, February 28; ratifications exchanged at Guatemala City, October 8, 1902; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 405; effective ten years.

Mexico—Persia. Signed May 14.

Argentina—Chile. Signed at Santiago, May 28; see 1910.

1903

France—Great Britain. Signed at London, October 14; ratifications exchanged February 25, 1904; published in *Journal Officiel*, March 10, 1904; 96 B. F. and S. P., 35, and For. Rel., 1904, 9; effective five years; renewed October 14, 1908, by exchange of notes.

Germany—Venezuela. Signed May 7.

Paraguay—Peru. Signed May 18; see 1906.

Argentina—Spain. Signed at Buenos Aires, September 17; text in 2 *Deuxième Conférence de la Paix*, 941; effective ten years; negotiated to supersede

Argentina—Spain. Signed January 28, 1902; ratifications exchanged July 18; effective ten years.

France—Italy. Signed at Paris, December 25; ratifications exchanged March 26, 1904; published in *Journal Officiel*, March 30, 1904, and 96 B. F. and S. P., 620; effective five years; renewed December 24, 1908, by exchange of notes.

Cuba—Italy. Signed at Havana, December 29; ratifications exchanged at Havana, December 2, 1904; effective ten years; automatically renewed if not denounced; is treaty of peace, commerce, navigation, emigration and arbitration (Article XXVII); text in 96 B. F. and S. P., 370.

1904

Great Britain—Italy. Signed at Rome, February 1; exchange of ratifications not necessary; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 57; effective five years; renewed at London by exchange of notes, January 4, 1909.

Denmark—Netherlands. Signed at Copenhagen, February 12; ratifications exchanged at The Hague, March 8, 1906; ratified by Denmark, February 6, 1906, and by Netherlands, March 8, 1906; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 454, and For. Rel., 1906, 530; effective till denunciation.

France—Spain. Signed at Paris, February 26; ratifications exchanged at Paris, March 7–April 20; published in *Journal Officiel*, May 2, 1904, and 97 B. F. and S. P., 953, and 98 *ibid.*, 1180; effective five years; renewed February 3, 1909.

Great Britain—Spain. Signed at London, February 27; ratifications exchanged at London, March 16; ratified by _____, March 7; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 80; effective five years; renewed by exchange of notes at London, January 11, 1909.

France—Netherlands. Signed at Paris, April 6; ratifications exchanged at Paris, July 5, 1905; effective five years; renewed December 29, 1909, Netherlands law ratifying renewal, May 23, 1910; published in *Journal Officiel*, July 12, 1905, and 99 B. F. and S. P., 1085; French decree approving convention for renewal issued July 26, 1910; ratifications of renewing convention exchanged at Paris, July 5, 1910.

Portugal—Spain. Signed at Lisbon, May 31; ratifications exchanged at Lisbon, February 27, 1909; approved by Portugal, August 18, 1908; text in N. R. G., 2, 149, and For. Rel., 1904, 701; effective five years.

France—Norway.² Signed at Paris, July 9; ratifications exchanged November 9; published in *Journal Officiel*, November 16, 1904, and 97 B. F. and S. P., 971; effective five years; renewed November 5, 1909, by exchange of notes.

France—Sweden.² Signed at Paris, July 9; ratifications exchanged November 9; published in *Journal Officiel*, November 16, 1904, and 97 B. F. and S. P., 971; effective five years; renewed by exchange of notes at Paris, November 5, 1909.

Germany—Great Britain. Signed at London, July 12; exchange of ratifications not necessary; effective five years; renewed at London by

² These treaties were concluded with the King of Sweden and Norway before the separation of those two states, June, 1905. They remain in force as between the one party and each of the two states originally jointly contractant and are therefore listed now as separate treaties. A note of the Norwegian minister of December 7, 1905 (For. Rel., 1905, 873; Treaties, Conventions, etc., 1300), says: "The Norwegian Government is of the opinion that all the conventions and international agreements concluded by Norway with one or several other states, either jointly with Sweden, or separately, or as an adhering party, continue in full force and effect, as heretofore, between Norway and the other contracting party or parties without any change in their provisions being effected by the dissolution of the union." Cf. 98 B. F. and S. P., 833 ff.

exchange of notes for a further period of one year, June 7–July 9, 1909, and again for four years, November 23–December 7, 1909; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 56; effective till July 12, 1914.

Great Britain—Norway.³ Signed at London, August 11; ratifications exchanged at London, November 9; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 91; effective five years; renewed by convention at London for a further period of five years, November 9, 1909.

Great Britain—Sweden.³ Signed at London, August 11; ratifications exchanged at London, November 9; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 91; effective five years; renewed by convention at London for a further period of five years, November 9, 1909.

Netherlands—Portugal. Signed at The Hague, October 1; ratifications exchanged at The Hague, October 29, 1908; ratified by law of Netherlands, February 5, 1906; proclaimed by Netherlands, December 21, 1908; effective for an indeterminate period.

Nicaragua—Spain. Signed at Guatemala City, October 4; ratifications exchanged at Paris, March 19, 1908; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 896.

Belgium—Russia. Signed at St. Petersburg, October (17) 30; ratifications exchanged at St. Petersburg, (August 27) September 9, 1905; promulgated by Belgium, January 19, 1906; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 569, and For. Rel., 1905, 78; effective ten years.

Belgium—Switzerland. Signed at Bern, November 15; ratifications exchanged at Bern, August 19, 1905; promulgated by Belgium, January 19, 1906; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 591, and For. Rel., 1905, 80; effective ten years.

Great Britain—Portugal. Signed at Windsor Castle, November 16; exchange of ratifications not necessary; approved by Portuguese Chamber, August 18, 1908; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 68; effective five years; renewed at London by exchange of notes for a further period of five years, November 16, 1909.

Great Britain—Switzerland. Signed at London, November 16; ratifications exchanged at London, July 12, 1905; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 93; effective five years; renewed by exchange of notes for a further period of five years, November 3–12, 1909.

Italy—Switzerland. Signed at Rome, November 23; ratifications exchanged December 5, 1905; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 513; effective five years; renewed at Rome by exchange of notes for a further period of five years, November 16, 1909.

Belgium—Norway.³ Signed at Brussels, November 30; ratifications exchanged at Brussels, August 11, 1905; promulgated by Belgium, January 19, 1906; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 573, and For. Rel., 1905, 81; effective ten years.

³ See Note 2.

Belgium—Sweden.³ Signed at Brussels, November 30; ratifications exchanged at Brussels, August 11, 1905; promulgated by Belgium, January 19, 1906; text in 97 B. F. and S. P., 573, and For. Rel., 1905, 81; effective ten years.

Norway—Russia. Signed at St. Petersburg, (November 26) December 9; ratifications exchanged February (12) 25–February (14) 27, 1905; effective ten years.

Russia—Sweden.³ Signed at St. Petersburg, (November 26) December 9; ratifications exchanged February (12) 25–February (14) 27, 1905; effective ten years.

Austria-Hungary—Switzerland. Signed at Bern, December 3; ratifications exchanged at Vienna, October 17, 1905; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 1082; effective five years.

France—Switzerland. Signed at Bern, December 14; ratifications exchanged at Paris, July 13, 1905; published in *Journal Officiel*, July 21, 1905, and 98 B. F. and S. P., 464; effective five years; renewed for two years by exchange of notes at Paris, July 13, 1910.

Sweden—Switzerland. Signed at Berlin, December 17; ratifications exchanged at Berlin, July 13, 1905; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 791; effective ten years.

Norway—Switzerland. Signed at Berlin, December 17; ratifications exchanged at Berlin, July 13, 1905; text in B. F. and S. P., 791; effective ten years.

1905

Austria-Hungary—Great Britain. Signed at London, January 11; see 1910.

Belgium—Spain. Signed at Madrid, January 23; ratifications exchanged December 16; ratified by _____, July 28; promulgated January 19, 1906; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 405, and For. Rel., 1905, 83; effective ten years.

Norway—Spain. Signed at Madrid, January 23; ratifications exchanged at Madrid, March 20; text in N. R. G., 1, 287, and 2, 223; effective ten years.

Spain—Sweden.³ Signed at Madrid, January 23; ratifications exchanged at Madrid, March 20; text in N. R. G., 1, 287, and 2, 223; effective ten years.

Great Britain—Netherlands. Signed at London, February 15; ratifications exchanged at London, July 12;⁴ ratified by Norway, June 7; text

⁴ *La Paix par le Droit*, 1911, 40, says July 5.

in 98 B. F. and S. P., 59, For. Rel., 1905, 693, and 5 Supp., A. J. I. L., 125; effective five years; renewed by convention of December 16, 1909; ratifications of renewing convention exchanged at London, July 11, 1910; Netherlands law ratifying renewing convention passed May 23, 1910.

Denmark—Russia. Signed at St. Petersburg, (February 16) March 1; ratifications exchanged at April (11) 24; ratified at Copenhagen by the Danish Riksdag, March 29, and at St. Petersburg, (March 20) April 3; text in For. Rel., 1905, 292; effective ten years.

Honduras—Spain. Signed at Madrid, March 13; ratifications exchanged at Madrid, July 16, 1906; published in *La Gaceta Oficial*, August 21, 1906, and For. Rel., 1906, 1353; effective twelve years.

Italy—Peru. Signed at Lima, April 18; ratified December 11, 1905, by ; effective ten years.

Belgium—Greece. Signed at Athens, (April 19) May 2; ratifications exchanged July (9) 22, 1905; ratified by Belgium, May 2; promulgated January 19, 1906; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 407, and For. Rel., 1905, 86; effective five years.

Belgium—Denmark. Signed at Brussels, April 26; ratifications exchanged at Brussels, May 2, 1906; promulgated by Belgium, January 19, 1906; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 685, and For. Rel., 1905, 84; effective ten years.

Norway—Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, May 6; see 1908.

Portugal—Sweden. Signed at Lisbon, May 6; ratifications exchanged at Stockholm, October 23, 1908; approved by Portugal, August 18, 1908; effective five years.

Italy—Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, May 11; promulgated by Italian decree of July 2, 1905; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 664; effective five years.

Belgium—Roumania. Signed at Bukharest, May (14) 27; ratifications exchanged at Bukharest, (September 26) October 9, 1905; proclaimed January 19, 1906; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 409, and N. R. G., 2, 236; effective five years.

Colombia—Ecuador. Signed at Quito, August 10; ratifications exchanged at Quito, October 24, 1907; general treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation, extradition, arbitration (Art. III), contraband of war, slave trade, consuls, etc.; text in 99 B. F. and S. P., 1012; perpetual by Art. XXVII in respect to Art. III.

Portugal—Switzerland. Signed at Bern, August 18; ratifications exchanged at Bern, October 23, 1908; approved by Portuguese Chamber, August 18, 1908; text in N. R. G., 2, 273; effective five years.

Argentina—Brazil. Signed at Rio de Janeiro, September 7;⁵ ratifications exchanged at Buenos Aires, November 9, 1908; approved by Argentina,

⁵ Anniversary of Brazilian independence.

December 2, and by Brazil, October 1, 1908; ratified by Brazil, December 5, 1908; formally promulgated by Argentina, December 24, 1908, and by Brazil, January 7, 1909; permanently signed at Rio de Janeiro, June 19, 1909; text in N. R. G., 2, 274; effective ten years.

Colombia—Peru. Signed at Bogotá, September 12, 1905; ratifications exchanged July 6, 1906; text in For. Rel., 1905, 256; effective ten years.

Denmark—France. Signed at Copenhagen, September 15; see 1911.

Denmark—Great Britain. Signed at London, October 25; ratifications exchanged at London, May 4, 1906; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 44; effective five years; renewed by convention of March 3, 1911; ratifications exchanged at London, May 3, 1911; Treaty Series (1911) No. 10.

Norway—Sweden. Signed at Stockholm, October 26; ratified by *procès-verbal* of October 26; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 820; effective ten years.

Denmark—Spain. Signed at Madrid, December 1; ratifications exchanged at Madrid, May 19, 1906; ratified by Denmark, May 10, and by Spain, May 14; text in 99 B. F. and S. P., 1037; effective six years.

Denmark—Italy. Signed at Rome, December 14; ratifications exchanged at Rome, May 22, 1906; proclaimed by King of Italy, May 27, 1906; text in 99 B. F. and S. P., 1035, and For. Rel., 1906, 528; effective until denunciation.

1906

Austria-Hungary—Portugal. Signed at Vienna, February 13; approved August 18, 1908, by the Portuguese Chamber, and by Austria-Hungary at Vienna, October 16, 1908; effective five years.

Belgium—Nicaragua. Signed at Guatemala City, March 6; ratifications exchanged at Guatemala City, July 20, 1909; text in *Bulletin Usuel*, September 2, 1909, 99 B. F. and S. P., 869, and N. R. G., 2, 753; effective ten years.

Paraguay—Peru. Signed at La Paz, June 24; may supersede

Paraguay—Peru. Signed ; May 18, 1903.

France—Portugal. Signed at Paris, June 29; ratifications exchanged at Paris, April 5, 1909; approved by Portugal, August 18, 1908; published in *Journal Officiel*, April 9, 1909; effective nine years.

1907

Bolivia—Paraguay. Signed at Buenos Aires, January 12.

Denmark—Portugal. Signed at Copenhagen, March 20; ratifications exchanged at Copenhagen, October 26, 1908; approved by Portuguese Chamber, August 18, 1908; text in N. R. G., 2, 304; effective ten years.

Spain—Switzerland. Signed at Bern, May 14; ratifications exchanged at Bern, July 9; text in *For. Rel.*, 1907, 1014; effective five years.

Argentina—Italy. Signed during the Peace Conference at The Hague, September 18; ratifications exchanged at Rome, May 21, 1910; promulgated by Italian decree of August 9, 1910; text in 5 *Supp.*, A. J. I. L., 171, N. R. G., 4, 84, and 1 *Deuxième Conférence de la Paix*, 174; effective ten years; superseding

Argentina—Italy. Signed at Rome, July 23, 1898; ratifications exchanged at Buenos Aires, ; text in *Conférence internationale de la Paix*, 1899, I^e partie, 146; effective ten years.

Italy—Mexico. Signed at The Hague, October 16, during Peace Conference; ratifications exchanged at Rome, December 31; ratified by Italy, March 7, 1908; effective ten years.

1908

United States⁶—France. Signed at Washington, February 10; see 1911.

United States—Greece. Signed February 29.

United States—Switzerland. Signed at Washington, February 29; ratifications exchanged at Washington, December 23; approved by United States Senate, March 6; ratified by President of the United States, May 29, and by Switzerland, October 13; proclaimed by President of the United States, December 23; effective five years.

United States—Mexico. Signed at Washington, March 24; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 27; ratification advised by United States Senate, April 2; ratified by President of the United States, May 29; ratified by Mexico, May 30; proclaimed by President of the United States, June 29; effective five years.

United States—Italy. Signed at Washington, March 28; ratifications exchanged at Washington, January 22, 1909; ratification advised by United States Senate, April 2, 1908; ratified by President of the United States, June 19; proclaimed by President of the United States, January 25, 1909; effective five years; superseding

United States—Italy. Signed at , December 24, 1904; not ratified.

United States—Great Britain. Signed at Washington, April 4; see 1911.

United States—Norway. Signed at Washington, April 4; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 24; ratification advised by United

⁶ The treaties negotiated by the United States in 1908 and 1909 are identic, and may be found textually in *Treaties, Conventions, etc.*, 1776-1909.

States Senate, April 17; ratified by President of the United States, June 18; proclaimed by President of the United States, June 29; effective five years.

United States—Portugal. Signed at Washington, April 6; ratifications exchanged at Washington, November 14; approved by Portuguese Chamber, August 18, and ratified September 21; ratification advised by United States Senate, April 17; ratified by President of the United States, November 6; proclaimed by President of the United States, December 14; effective five years.

United States—Spain. Signed at Washington, April 20; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 2; ratified by Spain, May 11, and by United States, May 28; ratification advised by United States Senate, April 22; proclaimed by President of the United States, June 3; effective five years.

United States—Netherlands. Signed at Washington, May 2; ratifications exchanged at Washington, March 25, 1909; ratification advised by United States Senate, May 6, 1908; ratified by President of the United States, January 8, 1909; ratified by Netherlands, March 5, 1909; proclaimed by President of the United States, March 25, 1909; effective five years.

United States—Sweden. Signed at Washington, May 2; ratifications exchanged at Washington, August 18; ratification advised by United States Senate, May 6; ratified by President of the United States, June 6, and by Sweden, June 13; proclaimed by President of the United States, September 1; effective five years.

United States—Japan. Signed at Washington, May 5; ratifications exchanged at Washington, August 24; ratification advised by United States Senate, May 13; ratified by President of the United States, August 19, and by Japan, July 20; proclaimed by President of the United States, September 1, 1908; text in Treaty Series No. 509; effective five years.

United States—Denmark. Signed at Washington, May 18; ratifications exchanged at Washington, March 29, 1909; ratification advised by United States Senate, May 20, and approved by Danish Parliament, February 6, 1909; ratified by President of the United States, January 8, 1909, and by Denmark, February 15, 1909; proclaimed by President of the United States, March 29, 1909; effective five years.

Denmark—Sweden. Signed at Stockholm, July 17; ratifications exchanged at Stockholm, February 26, 1909; approved by Danish Parliament, February 6, 1909; text in N. R. G., 2, 755; effective ten years.

United States—China. Signed at Washington, October 8; ratifications exchanged at Washington, April 6, 1909; ratification advised by United States Senate, December 10; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, 1909, and by China, February 12, 1909; proclaimed by President of the United States, April 6, 1909; effective five years.

Denmark—Norway. Signed at Copenhagen, October 8; ratifications exchanged at Copenhagen, March 6, 1909; approved by Danish Parliament, February 6, 1909; text in N. R. G., 2, 758; effective ten years.

United States—Peru. Signed at Washington, December 5; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 29, 1909, ratification advised by United States Senate, December 10; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, 1909, and by Peru, May 1, 1909; proclaimed by President of the United States, June 30, 1909; effective five years.

Norway—Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, December 8; ratifications exchanged at Lisbon, November 3, 1909; text in N. R. G., 3, 208; superseding

Norway—Portugal. Signed at Lisbon, May 6, 1905; ratifications exchanged at Stockholm, October 23, 1908; approved by Portugal, August 18, 1908; effective five years.

Colombia—France. Signed at Bogotá, December 16; ratifications exchanged at Bogotá, October 6, 1909; ratified by France, March 10, 1909; promulgated by French decree of December 31, 1909, and published in *Journal Officiel*, January 6, 1910; additional convention signed at Bogotá, August 5, 1910; ratifications exchanged at Paris, November 15, 1911; text in N. R. G., 3, 210.

United States—Salvador. Signed at Washington, December 21; ratifications exchanged at Washington, July 3, 1909; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 6, 1909; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, 1909; ratified by Salvador, June 14; proclaimed by President of the United States, July 7, 1909; effective five years.

United States—Argentina. Signed at Washington, December 23; ratified by United States, March 1, 1909; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 6, 1909; effective five years.

Colombia—Great Britain. Signed at Bogotá, December 30; exchange of ratifications not necessary; ratified by Colombia, July 14, 1909; text in Treaty Series (1909) No. 5; effective five years.

1909

United States—Haiti. Signed at Washington, January 7; ratifications exchanged at Washington, November 15; ratification advised by United States Senate, February 13; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, and by Haitian President, March 22; approved by Haitian Congress, July 23; proclaimed by President of the United States, November 16; effective five years.

United States—Bolivia. Signed at Washington, January 7; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 13; ratified by President of the United States, March 1; effective five years.

United States—Ecuador. Signed at Washington, January 7; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 22, 1910; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 13; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, and by Ecuadorian President, October 21; proclaimed June 23, 1910; effective five years.

United States—Uruguay. Signed at Washington, January 9; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 13; ratified by President of the United States, March 1; effective five years.

United States—Costa Rica. Signed at Washington, January 13; ratifications exchanged at Washington, July 20; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 20; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, by Costa Rica, June 28; proclaimed by President of the United States, July 21; effective five years.

United States—Chile. Signed at Washington, January 13; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 20; ratified by President of the United States, March 1; effective five years.

United States—Austria-Hungary. Signed at Washington, January 15; ratifications exchanged at Washington, May 13; ratified by President of the United States, March 1, and by Austria-Hungary, April 17; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 20; proclaimed by President of the United States, May 18; effective five years.

United States—Brazil. Signed at Washington, January 23; ratifications exchanged at Washington, July 26, 1911; ratified by President of the United States, March 1; ratification advised by United States Senate, January 27; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910; effective five years.

United States—Paraguay. Signed at Asunción, March 13; ratifications exchanged at Asunción, October 2; ratified by President of the United States, August 10, and by Paraguay, September 28; ratification advised by United States Senate, July 30, and by Paraguay, July 30; proclaimed by President of the United States, November 11; effective five years.

Brazil—Portugal. Signed at Petropolis, March 25; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910; effective five years.

Brazil—France. Signed at Petropolis, April 4; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910.

Brazil—Spain. Signed at Petropolis, April 8; ratifications exchanged at Rio de Janeiro, June 29, 1911; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910; text in *La Gaceta* of Madrid, July 27, 1911.

Brazil—Mexico. Signed at Petropolis, April 8; ratifications exchanged at Rio de Janeiro, June 29, 1911; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910.

Brazil—Honduras. Signed at Guatemala City, April 26; approved by Honduras, July 30, and by Brazil, December 31, 1910; terms in *La Gaceta*, Guatemala, August 19.

Brazil—Venezuela. Signed at Caracas, April 30; ratifications exchanged at Caracas, January 8, 1912; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910.

Brazil—Panama. Signed at Washington, May 1; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910.

Brazil—Ecuador. Signed at Washington, May 13; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910; ratified by Ecuador, February 12, 1912; effective five years.

Brazil—Costa Rica. Signed at Washington, May 18; ratified by Costa Rican President, October 20; approved by Costa Rica, October 11, and by Brazil, December 31, 1910; published in *La Gaceta Oficial*, October 24; effective five years.

Brazil—Cuba. Signed at Washington, June 10; ratifications exchanged at Havana, August 2, 1911; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910; text in *La Gaceta Oficial* of Cuba, August 14, 1911; ratifications exchanged at Rio de Janeiro, May 6, 1911; effective five years.

Brazil—Great Britain. Signed at Petropolis, June 18; approved by Brazilian Parliament, July 21, and by Brazilian Government, December 31, 1910; text in Treaty Series (1911) No. 12; effective five years.

Argentina—Great Britain and Ireland. Signed at Rio de Janeiro, June 18.

Brazil—Bolivia. Signed at Petropolis, June 25; approved by Brazil, December 31, 1910; promulgated in Official Register of Bolivia, March 15, 1912; effective ten years.

Brazil—Nicaragua. Signed at Guatemala, June 28; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31, 1910; effective five years.

Brazil—Norway. Signed at Christiania, July 13; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31, 1910; effective five years.

Nicaragua—Portugal. Signed at _____, July 17.

Brazil—China. Signed at Peking, August 3; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31, 1910; effective five years.

Argentina—Portugal. Signed August 27.

Brazil—Salvador. Signed at Salvador, September 3; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31, 1910; effective five years.

Brazil—Peru. Signed at Rio de Janeiro, November 5; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31, 1910; effective ten years.

Italy—Netherlands. Signed at Rome, November 21; ratifications exchanged at Rome, August 26, 1910; proclaimed by Italian order of September 5, 1910.

Brazil—Sweden. Signed December 14; effective ten years.

Greece—Spain. Signed at Athens, December (3) 16; ratifications exchanged at Athens, March (11) 24, 1910; text in N. R. G., 4, 711; effective five years.

1910

Costa Rica—Italy. Signed at Rome, January 8; ratifications exchanged at Rome, November 3; text in *Gazzetta Ufficiale*, 1911, No. 33, and N. R. G., 4, 713; effective ten years.

Costa Rica—Panama. Signed at Washington, March 17; approved by Costa Rican Congress, August 25; promulgated by Costa Rica, September 25; approved by Congress of Panama, September 27.

Brazil—Haiti. Signed at Washington, April 25; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31.

Brazil—Dominican Republic. Signed at Washington, April 29; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31.

Belgium—Honduras. Signed at , April 29.

Brazil—Colombia. Signed at Bogotá, July 7; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31.

Austria—Hungary—Great Britain. Signed at London, July 16; ratifications exchanged at London, December 2; presented to Parliament, February, 1911; text in Treaty Series (1911) No. 1; effective five years; presumably to supersede

Austria—Hungary—Great Britain. Signed at London, January 11, 1905; ratifications exchanged at London, May 17; text in 98 B. F. and S. P., 37; effective five years.

Russia—Spain. Signed at St. Petersburg, August (2) 15; ratifications exchanged at St. Petersburg, November (9) 22; text in 5 Supp., A. J. I. L., 217; effective ten years.

Brazil—Russia. Signed at Rio de Janeiro, August 26; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31.

Brazil—Greece. Signed at , August 28.

Greece—Italy. Signed at , September 2.

Italy—Spain. Signed at , September 2.

Argentina—France. Signed at Buenos Aires, September 7.

Argentina—Chile. Signed at , September 13; to supersede

Argentina—Chile. Signed at Santiago, May 28, 1902; ratifications exchanged at Santiago, September 22; preliminary act and additional explication signed May 28 and July 10, 1902; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 759; effective ten years.

Austria-Hungary—Brazil. Signed at Rio de Janeiro, October 19; approved by Brazilian Government, December 31.

Italy—Russia. Signed at St. Petersburg, October (14) 27; ratifications exchanged at St. Petersburg, January (12) 25, 1911; in force February (12) 25, 1911.

Belgium—Italy. Signed at Brussels, November 18; approved by Belgian Chamber, May 1, 1911; ratified by Belgian Chamber, May 4, 1911; Belgian law approving promulgated June 4, 1911; text in *Moniteur belge*, September 2, 1911; effective ten years.

Italy—Norway. Signed at Rome, December 4; ratifications exchanged at Rome, December 22, 1910; text in N. R. G., 4, 728; effective until denunciation.

1911

Brazil—Uruguay. Signed at Petropolis, January 12.

Brazil—Paraguay. Signed at _____, February 24.

Bolivia—Peru. Protocol signed at Lima, March 31; cited in 49 *Mémorial diplomatique*, 226; may supersede

Bolivia—Peru. Signed at La Paz, November 21, 1901; ratifications exchanged at La Paz, December 29, 1903; agreement extending time of ratification signed November 11-12, 1902; text in 95 B. F. and S. P., 1018; effective ten years.

Italy—Sweden. Signed at Stockholm, April 13; ratifications exchanged at Stockholm, _____; text in *Annuaire de l'Union interparlementaire*, 1912, 138; effective ten years.

Argentina—Ecuador. Signed at Caracas, July 16 (circa).

Argentina—Venezuela. Signed at Caracas, July 24.

United States—France.⁷ Signed at Washington, August 3, 1911; ratification advised by United States Senate (after revision), March 7, 1912 (legislative day of March 5); text in 5 Supp., A. J. I. L., 249; negotiated to supersede

United States—France. Signed at Washington, February 10, 1908; ratifications exchanged at Washington, March 12; ratified by United States, February 27, and by France, March 3; ratification advised by United States Senate, February 19; proclaimed by President of the United States, March 14; published in *Journal Officiel*, March 15, 1908; effective five years.

⁷ These two treaties are at present with the President of the United States, whose ratification is necessary as a step in transforming them into law. Owing to the changes stipulated by the Senate as a *sine qua non* of ratification, France and Great Britain delayed action upon them, and until the President takes the initiative they are dead letters. It will be noticed that the conventional terms of the previous treaties expire on March 12 and June 4, 1913, respectively. In advance of those dates action will have to be taken in respect to renewing or superseding them. Inasmuch as the treaties of 1911, as revised by the Senate, are preferable to the earlier treaties because their arbitral basis is broader, it is suggested that at the time of the expiration of the 1908 treaties they be allowed to lapse and the treaties of 1911 be then substituted for them.

United States—Great Britain.⁷ Signed at Washington, August 3, 1911; ratification advised by United States Senate (after revision), March 7, 1912 (legislative day of March 5); text in 5 Supp., A. J. I. L., 253; negotiated to supersede

United States—Great Britain. Signed at Washington, April 4, 1908; ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 4; ratification advised by United States Senate, April 22; ratified by President of the United States, May 11; proclaimed by President of the United States, June 5; ratified by Great Britain, May 4; effective five years.

Denmark—France. Signed at Copenhagen, August 9; ratifications exchanged at Copenhagen, December 21; promulgated by France, December 27; published in *Journal Officiel*, December 30, 6 Supp., A. J. I. L., 90, and *Revue Général de Droit International Public*, 1911, Documents 40; superseding

Denmark—France. Signed at Copenhagen, September 15, 1905; ratifications exchanged at Copenhagen, May 31, 1906; ratified by Denmark, May 31, 1906; treaty identical with that of France—Great Britain; published in *Journal Officiel*, June 30, 1906, and 98 B. F. and S. P., 845; effective five years; continued from May 31, 1911, till January 1, 1912, by exchange of notes of May 27, 1911 (cf. *Journal Officiel*, June 4, 1911).

Brazil—Denmark. Signed at Copenhagen, November 27; ratifications reported; text in *Annuaire de l'Union interparlementaire*, 1912, 146; effective ten years.

1912

Argentina—Colombia. Signed at Washington, January 20.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY. .

The following is a summary by years of the treaties listed above:—

1899	3
1901	1
1902	12
1903	6
1904	26
1905	23
1906	4
1907	5
1908	22
1909	32
1910	18
1911	10
1912	1
	<hr/>
Gross total	163
Deducting duplicated supersessions	9
	<hr/>
Net total	154

N.B.—Presumably each of the 154 treaties, net, listed is on the way to complete ratification and effectiveness, though a due suspicion may arise against those incomplete ones of dates three or more years old.

SUMMARY BY COUNTRIES.

- Argentina (14)—Bolivia (1902), Brazil (1905), Chile (1910), Colombia (1912), Ecuador (1911), France (1910), Great Britain (1909), Italy (1907), Paraguay (1899), Portugal (1909), Spain (1903), United States (1908), Uruguay (1899), Venezuela (1911).
- Austria-Hungary (5)—Brazil (1910), Great Britain (1910), Portugal (1906), Switzerland (1904), United States (1909).
- Belgium (11)—Denmark (1905), Greece (1905), Honduras (1910), Italy (1910), Nicaragua (1906), Norway (1904), Roumania (1905), Russia (1904), Spain (1905), Sweden (1904), Switzerland (1904).
- Bolivia (6)—Argentina (1902), Brazil (1909), Paraguay (1907), Peru (1911), Spain (1902), United States (1909).
- Brazil (30)—Argentina (1905), Austria-Hungary (1910), Bolivia (1909), Chile (1899), China (1909), Colombia (1910), Costa Rica (1909), Cuba (1909), Denmark (1911), Ecuador (1909), France (1909), Great Britain (1909), Greece (1910), Haiti (1910), Honduras (1909), Mexico (1909), Nicaragua (1909), Norway (1909), Panama (1909), Paraguay (1911), Peru (1909), Portugal (1909), Russia (1910), Salvador (1909), San Domingo (1910), Spain (1909), Sweden (1909), United States (1909), Uruguay (1911), Venezuela (1909).
- Chile (3)—Argentina (1910), Brazil (1899), United States (1909).
- China (2)—Brazil (1909), United States (1908).
- Colombia (7)—Argentina (1912), Brazil (1910), Ecuador (1905), France (1908), Great Britain (1908), Peru (1905), Spain (1902).
- Costa Rica (4)—Brazil (1909), Italy (1909), Panama (1910), United States (1909).
- Cuba (2)—Brazil (1909), Italy (1903).
- Denmark (12)—Belgium (1905), Brazil (1911), France (1911), Great Britain (1905), Italy (1905), Netherlands (1904), Norway (1908), Portugal (1905), Russia (1908), Spain (1905), Sweden (1908), United States (1908).
- Ecuador (4)—Argentina (1911), Brazil (1909), Colombia (1905), United States (1909).
- France (13)—Argentina (1910), Brazil (1909), Colombia (1908), Denmark (1911), Great Britain (1903), Italy (1903), Netherlands (1904), Norway (1904), Portugal (1906), Spain (1904), Sweden (1904), Switzerland (1905), United States (1911).
- Germany (2)—Great Britain (1904), Venezuela (1903).
- Greece (5)—Belgium (1905), Brazil (1910), Italy (1910), Spain (1909), United States (1908).

- Great Britain (15)—Argentina (1909), Austria-Hungary (1910), Brazil (1909), Colombia (1908), Denmark (1905), France (1903), Germany (1904), Italy (1904), Netherlands (1905), Norway (1904), Portugal (1904), Spain (1904), Sweden (1904), Switzerland (1904), United States (1911).
- Guatemala (1)—Spain (1902).
- Haiti (2)—Brazil (1910), United States (1909).
- Honduras (3)—Belgium (1910), Brazil (1909), Spain (1905).
- Italy (18)—Argentina (1907), Belgium (1910), Costa Rica (1909), Cuba (1903), Denmark (1905), France (1903), Great Britain (1904), Greece (1910), Mexico (1907), Netherlands (1909), Norway (1910), Peru (1905), Portugal (1905), Russia (1910), Spain (1910), Sweden (1911), Switzerland (1904), United States (1908).
- Japan (1)—United States (1908).
- Mexico (5)—Brazil (1909), Italy (1907), Persia (1902), Spain (1902), United States (1908).
- Netherlands (6)—Denmark (1904), France (1904), Great Britain (1905), Italy (1909), Portugal (1904), United States (1905).
- Nicaragua (4)—Belgium (1906), Brazil (1909), Portugal (1909), Spain (1904).
- Norway (12)—Belgium (1904), Brazil (1909), Denmark (1908), France (1904), Great Britain (1904), Italy (1910), Portugal (1905), Russia (1904), Spain (1905), Sweden (1905), Switzerland (1904), United States (1908).
- Panama (2)—Brazil (1909), Costa Rica (1910).
- Paraguay (6)—Argentina (1899), Bolivia (1907), Brazil (1910), Peru (1906), Spain (1902), United States (1909).
- Persia (1)—Mexico (1902).
- Peru (6)—Bolivia (1911), Brazil (1909), Colombia (1905), Italy (1905), Paraguay (1906), United States (1908).
- Portugal (14)—Argentina (1909), Austria-Hungary (1906), Brazil (1909), Denmark (1907), France (1906), Great Britain (1904), Italy (1905), Netherlands (1904), Nicaragua (1909), Norway (1905), Spain (1904), Sweden (1905), Switzerland (1905), United States (1908).
- Roumania (1)—Belgium (1905).
- Russia (7)—Belgium (1904), Brazil (1910), Denmark (1905), Italy (1910), Norway (1904), Spain (1910), Sweden (1904).
- Salvador (3)—Brazil (1909), Spain (1902), United States (1908).
- San Domingo (2)—Brazil (1910), Spain (1902).
- Spain (24)—Argentina (1903), Belgium (1905), Bolivia (1902), Brazil (1909), Colombia (1902), Denmark (1905), France (1904), Great Britain (1904), Greece (1909), Guatemala (1902), Honduras (1905), Italy (1910), Mexico (1902), Nicaragua (1904), Norway (1905), Paraguay (1902), Portugal (1904), Russia (1910), Salvador (1902), San Domingo (1902), Sweden (1905), Switzerland (1907), United States (1908), Uruguay (1902).

Sweden (12)—Belgium (1904), Brazil (1909), Denmark (1908), France (1904), Great Britain (1904), Italy (1911), Norway (1905), Portugal (1905), Russia (1904), Spain (1905), Switzerland (1904), United States (1908).

Switzerland (10)—Austria-Hungary (1904), Belgium (1904), France (1904), Great Britain (1904), Italy (1904), Norway (1904), Portugal (1905), Spain (1907), Sweden (1904), United States (1908).

United States (26)—Argentina (1908), Austria-Hungary (1909), Bolivia (1909), Brazil (1909), Chile (1909), China (1908), Costa Rica (1909), Denmark (1908), Ecuador (1909), France (1911), Great Britain (1911), Greece (1908), Haiti (1909), Italy (1908), Japan (1908), Mexico (1908), Netherlands (1908), Norway (1908), Paraguay (1909), Peru (1908), Portugal (1908), Salvador (1908), Spain (1908), Sweden (1908), Switzerland (1908), Uruguay (1909).

Uruguay (4)—Argentina (1899), Brazil (1911), Spain (1902), United States (1908).

Venezuela (3)—Argentina (1911), Brazil (1909), Germany (1903).

NOTES

This list is a revision of one published in 1911, which was communicated to the diplomats accredited to the United States with a request for suggestions and corrections. One correction only was made, the day of a month having been printed incorrectly. The Ambassador of France kindly made a suggestion which has resulted in the Summary by Countries. The former list has been in considerable demand from all parts of the world, and, in accordance with a request recently received, the present list is being translated at Berlin for separate publication in German.

To make thoroughly clear the several stages of arbitration, it seems well to make the following statement concerning agreements to arbitrate and actual arbitrations:—

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES.—Agreements to arbitrate are of several kinds. The best-known system is that under the provisions of a convention of the Second Hague Conference,—revising and completing the plan of the First Conference,—called the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. This convention provides a system for offering good offices and mediation, establishes a constitution for international commissions of inquiry, and, in Part IV., Articles 37–90, provides a system for international “arbitration for settlement of disputes between States by judges of their own choice and on the basis of respect for law.” The Tribunal was originally constituted by a convention of the First Hague Conference of 1899, and has been in operation since 1902. Twelve cases have already been decided by it. Another is soon to be tried, and five more have been suggested within a year for submission.

In addition to this system, arbitration under treaty stipulations is provided for by the general conventions drawn up by the Pan-American and the Central American Conferences, and arbitration of specific questions is provided for in many of the constituent conventions which regulate the action of international unions.

NATIONAL TREATIES.—Besides this general machinery providing for arbitration, each nation may reach such agreements with other individual nations as it finds desirable for the settlement by arbitration of such questions as it considers proper to submit to such decision. There are forty-nine sovereign States in the world. If each had signed one of these bipartite treaties with all its peers, there would be 1,176 arbitration treaties between pairs of nations. Such a number, however, is not necessary, for the majority of the sovereign States do not come into sufficiently close contact with each other to result in difficulties which are incapable of settlement by ordinary diplomatic means. The Summary by Countries herewith shows accurately the extent to which the States coming into contact with each other are already protected by such treaties.

ARBITRATIONS.—Dr. W. Evans Darby, in his "Modern Pacific Settlements," lists 6 arbitrations in the eighteenth century, 471 in the nineteenth, and 63 from 1900 to 1903. Since 1900 there have been about 150 arbitrations, most of which have been held under the provisions of treaties. Many arbitrations have been held without treaty provision, the two disputant States in such cases agreeing to refer the matter to umpires or special courts mutually acceptable. But this haphazard system is rapidly giving way before the eager desire of the States of the world to enter into understandings with other States as to what questions they shall refer to arbitration.

TYPES OF TREATIES.—The great fault of the bipartite arbitration treaty has been the restriction which its terms have placed upon the scope of arbitration. In many cases the arbitrable subjects have been so few as to render the treaty almost worthless. The significance of the recent treaties negotiated by the United States with Great Britain and France is that, for the first time, they definitely recognized the legal character of arbitration and made the justiciable nature of the case at issue the test of arbitrability. Theretofore, where exceptions had been made, only the capricious opinion of the contracting parties, at a time when the dispute was acute, was left to determine the arbitrability of the case. This improved feature of the treaties was left unimpaired by the Senate. Contiguous States or those whose relations or rivalries are close naturally become careful about their engagements to arbitrate, though the success of this system of settling international disputes argues for a steadily widening scope. It follows that the smaller and so-called non-military States have usually led in advances of this kind. A treaty of amity and commerce between Belgium and Siam, signed at London, August 29, 1868, says in Article 24:—

If any difference shall arise between the two contracting countries which may not be settled amicably by diplomatic correspondence between the two governments, these governments shall, by common accord, nominate an arbitrator, some third neutral and friendly power, and the results of the arbitration shall be accepted by the two parties.

Denmark's treaties with the Netherlands and Italy contain this reference clause:—

The high contracting parties engage to submit to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the convention of July 29, 1899, all differences of whatever character which may arise between them which they have not been able to solve by diplomatic methods, and this shall be done in the case where there shall be differences whose origin is in facts previous to the conclusion of the present convention.

The six treaties of Argentina negotiated from 1899 to 1905 except only constitutional provisions, while Article 73 of the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic says textually:—

The Portuguese Republic, without prejudice to the stipulations contained in its treaties of alliance, recognizes the principle of arbitration as the best method of resolving international questions.

The average treaty, however, includes the formula excepting questions of "vital interest, independence and national honor,"—phrases objectionable only on account of vagueness in application.

The thirty treaties of Brazil differ somewhat in text, but little in meaning and scope, and are of this restricted type. The Brazilian-Chinese reference clause may be cited as inclusive of all elements employed in the set. It reads:—

Article I. Differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two Contracting Parties, and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established at The Hague by the Convention of the 29th July, 1899, provided, nevertheless, that they do not affect the vital interest, the independence, or the honor of the two Contracting States, and do not concern the interest of Third Parties: it being further understood that, if one of the two Contracting Parties prefer it, all arbitration resulting from the present Convention shall be submitted to a Head of a State, to a friendly Government, or one or more arbitrators chosen outside the list of the Tribunal of The Hague.

A type of general treaty not to be commended is illustrated by that of Colombia and Ecuador of 1905. Though it is evidently satisfactory to the contractants, its breadth of subject is such that practically all conventional matters are covered in it, and practice has demonstrated that it is better for a state to make many treaties on definite subjects rather than a few attempting to cover all points in their foreign relations. From this point of view the Colombian-Ecuadorian treaty is subject to criticism, though its arbitrable terms are thoroughly estimable:—

The Contracting Parties solemnly promise never to appeal to recourse to arms before they have essayed that of negotiation . . . and until due satisfaction has been expressly refused, after a friendly and neutral Power, chosen as Arbitrator, shall have given its decision on the justice of the demand in presence of the arguments and proofs adduced in support thereof by one side and of the replies of the other side.

A further type of treaty worthy of mention is that of 1911 between Denmark and France, which is officially described in these words: "This treaty was inspired by the labors of the Second Peace Conference and reproduces in its general lines the text accepted by 32 states, among which were France, the United States, Great Britain and Russia. It sanctions the idea of 'obligatory arbitration without reserves' for certain cases clearly defined and forming four principal categories (Art. 2). For other cases of contingent difference recourse to arbitration remains always possible, but the contracting states have the right to invoke the reserves of honor, vital interests, etc., and, as a result, not to submit to arbitration. There should be noted certain dispositions of this treaty (Art. 2, at end) which have for their purpose the lessening of the difficulties encountered at the conference in 1907 by the opponents of obligatory arbitration. Art. 4 likewise carries an innovation in providing that, if the contracting states cannot agree on the text of the *compromis*, the Permanent Court at The Hague will be competent to establish this text."

Another type of treaty now very common is that containing a clause specifying arbitration of disputes arising under the provisions of the treaty itself. These clauses are usually inserted in commercial treaties, and a recent compilation indicates that 141 such treaties have been negotiated by American nations since 1832. The letters explanatory of the Franco-German Moroccan and Congo conventions of November 4, 1911, contain such a provision. This type of treaty definitely throws many categories of problems out of the range of possible warlike operations, and contributes in detail to the development of arbitration.

The Franco-German agreement to arbitrate in respect to Congo and Moroccan questions is illustrative of this type. The explanatory letters say textually:—

Finally, desiring to give to said convention the character of an act destined not only to remove every cause for conflict between our two countries, but also to be an aid to our good relations, we are agreed in declaring that the differences which might arise between the contracting parties with regard to the interpretation and the application of the dispositions of the convention of November 4 and which might not be settled through diplomatic channels, shall be submitted to an arbitral tribunal organized according to the terms of The Hague Convention of October 18, 1907. An agreement shall have to be drawn up, and for that purpose the regulations of the same convention shall be followed, provided no derogation should be made thereto by special agreement at the time of the dispute.

A FRENCH PRECEDENT.—The progress of arbitration must depend upon governmental action, and it is therefore of no small importance to note that, in response to a desire expressed many times by the French delegation to the Second Hague Conference, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs by decree of March 7, 1911, designated two officials to deal with questions of international arbitration and the periodic Hague conferences. The report on foreign affairs read in the Chamber of Deputies this year (*Journal officiel*, 1255) says:—

The conclusion of treaties of arbitration with certain states and search for the formulas best adapted to the circumstances are the principal objects of the new service.

LEGAL EFFECT.—A treaty is not binding until it has passed through all its stages. A treaty signed by the negotiators binds only the negotiators and the empowering division of their governments. Before the governments themselves are legally bound, their ratifying authorities must have approved the treaty; and it becomes mutually binding only after the exchange of ratifications,—a formality by which each State receives a copy of the document properly signed by the negotiating officers and the ratifying authorities of each State. In most countries another step is necessary before the treaty is considered the law of the land. This is promulgation,—a formality of publishing the treaty as a proclamation. No treaty is binding until these several steps have been taken. Most treaties are reported publicly only when signed, and it is, therefore, often exceedingly difficult to follow them through their later history. This circumstance accounts for the incompleteness at any given time in the details of any such list as the present.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

- HALE — Mohonk Addresses. Mailing price, \$1.00
- RALSTON — International Arbitral Law and Procedure.
Mailing price, \$2.20
- SCOTT — American Addresses at the Second Hague Conference.
Mailing price, \$1.65
- MEAD — The Great Design of Henry IV. Mailing price, 55 cents
- SCOTT — The Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague.
Mailing price, \$2.20
- HULL — The Two Hague Conferences. Mailing price, \$1.65
- WALSH — The Moral Damage of War. Mailing price, 90 cents
- DODGE — War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ.
Mailing price, 60 cents
- BRIDGMAN — World Organization. Mailing price, 60 cents
- WARNER — The Ethics of Force. Mailing price, 55 cents
- CHANNING — Discourses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
- SUMNER — Addresses on War. Mailing price, 60 cents
- BLOCH — The Future of War. Mailing price, 65 cents
- EVANS — Life of Sir Randal Cremer. Mailing price, \$1.40
- REINSCH — Public International Unions. Mailing price, \$1.65
- BRIDGMAN — First Book of World Law. Mailing price, \$1.65
- SPILLER — Inter-Racial Problems. Mailing price, \$2.40
- VON SUTTNER — Memoirs. Mailing price, 2 volumes, \$4.00
- ROOT — Fisheries Arbitration Argument. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT.
Mailing price, \$3.50
-

THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION has also the following
works in pamphlet form

- BETHINK YOURSELVES! — By LEO TOLSTOL. Postpaid, 10 cents
- A LEAGUE OF PEACE: Rectorial Address before the University of St. Andrews
— By ANDREW CARNEGIE. Postpaid, 10 cents
- ORGANIZE THE WORLD — By EDWIN D. MEAD. Postpaid, 10 cents
- THE KING'S EASTER — By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. Postpaid, 10 cents
- THE BLOOD OF THE NATION — By DAVID STARR JORDAN. Postpaid, 15 cents
- PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. A Manual for Teachers
— By LUCIA AMES MEAD. Postpaid, 20 cents
- THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS — By CHARLES SUMNER. Postpaid,
20 cents
- THE WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS — By CHARLES
SUMNER. Postpaid, 20 cents
- THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY — By CHARLES SUMNER.
Postpaid, 20 cents

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

HEROES OF THE SEA

BY

W. M. THACKERAY

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

October, 1912, No. 7, Part I

Entered as second-class matter, April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

"Mr. Carnegie rendered no more signal service to the cause of peace when he provided for the erection of the splendid Temple of Peace at The Hague, as a fitting home for the International Tribunal, than when he provided, by his gift of five million dollars, since increased by other large gifts for the same purpose, for pensions for heroes of peace. The great service of this munificent endowment was in the new emphasis which it placed. It said that from now on the men who have shown their courage and devotion in saving life were to be applauded and rewarded as truly as the men who have destroyed life. It passed no judgment upon the battlefields of history. The generous giver, when he made his original and prophetic gift, doubtless felt, like others of us, that the battlefield has been the theater of infinite faithfulness, self-sacrifice and service, of the highest heroism often as well as the deepest horror. But he clearly felt that the esteem and glorification of the soldier had been out of all proportion to the honor paid the heroes of other fields than the battlefield, whose service, done to no accompaniment of life and drum or waving banners, often imposed far greater risk, demanded a far higher courage, and had a vastly nobler and more useful end. The time has come—it has been too long delayed—for a new adjustment, a distribution of honors and rewards upon a basis commensurate with our present actual civilization. The soldier who risks his life to save the state, or at the state's command, is a proper pensioner, but he is no more truly a public servant, nor the exponent or agent of patriotism, than the statesman or the teacher; and the policeman, the engineer, the fireman, the sailor and the surfman, faithful and firm at their dangerous posts, place us under equal obligation and deserve as well at our hands. Haltingly and at scattered points the community is beginning to recognize this fact. Until it recognizes it everywhere and in adequate measure, we are debtors to the generous individual pioneers who emphasize at cost the needed lesson."—From Edwin D. Mead's pamphlet on *Heroes of Peace*, published by the World Peace Foundation.

HEROES OF THE SEA.

BY W. M. THACKERAY.

From "On Ribbons" in "ROUNDABOUT PAPERS."

In a voyage to America, some nine years since, on the seventh or eighth day out from Liverpool, Captain L—— came to dinner at eight bells, as usual, talked a little to the persons right and left of him, and helped the soup with his accustomed politeness. Then he went on deck, and was back in a minute, and operated on the fish, looking rather grave the while.

Then he went on deck again; and this time was absent, it may be, three or five minutes, during which the fish disappeared, and the *entrées* arrived, and the roast beef. Say ten minutes passed—I can't tell after nine years.

Then L—— came down with a pleased and happy countenance this time, and began carving the sirloin: "We have seen the light," he said. "Madam, may I help you to a little gravy, or a little horse-radish?" or what not?

I forget the name of the light; nor does it matter. It was a point off Newfoundland for which he was on the lookout, and so well did the *Canada* know where she was that, between soup and beef, the captain had sighted the headland by which his course was lying.

And so through storm and darkness, through fog and midnight, the ship had pursued her steady way over the pathless ocean and roaring seas, so surely that the officers who sailed her knew her place within a minute or two, and guided us with a wonderful providence safe on our way. Since the noble Cunard Company has run its ships, but one accident, and that through the error of a pilot, has happened on the line.

By this little incident (hourly, of course, repeated, and trivial to all sea-going people) I own I was immensely moved, and never can think of it but with a heart full of thanks and awe. We trust our lives to these seamen; and how nobly they fulfill their trust! They are, under Heaven, as a providence for us. Whilst we sleep, their untiring watchfulness keeps guard over us. All night through that

bell sounds at its season, and tells how our sentinels defend us. It rang when the *Amazon* was on fire, and chimed its heroic signal of duty and courage and honor. Think of the dangers these seamen undergo for us: the hourly peril and watch; the familiar storm; the dreadful iceberg; the long winter nights when the decks are as glass, and the sailor has to climb through icicles to bend the stiff sail on the yard! Think of their courage and their kindnesses in cold, in tempest, in hunger, in wreck! "The women and children to the boats," says the captain of the *Birkenhead*,¹ and, with the troops formed on the deck and the crew obedient to the word of glorious command, the immortal ship goes down. Read the story of the *Sarah Sands*:—

"The screw steamship *Sarah Sands*, 1,330 registered tons, was chartered by the East India Company in the autumn of 1858 for the conveyance of troops to India. She was commanded by John Squire Castle. She took out a part of the 54th Regiment, upwards of 350 persons, besides the wives and children of some of the men, and the families of some of the officers. All went well till the 11th November, when the ship had reached lat. 14 S., long. 56 E., upwards of 400 miles from the Mauritius.

"Between three and four P.M. on that day a very strong smell of fire was perceived arising from the after-deck, and upon going below into the hold Captain Castle found it to be on fire, and immense volumes of smoke arising from it. Endeavors were made to reach the seat of the fire, but in vain; the smoke and heat were too much for the men. There was, however, no confusion. Every order was obeyed with the same coolness and courage with which it was given. The engine was immediately stopped. All sail was taken in, and the ship brought to the wind, so as to drive the smoke and fire, which was in the after-part of the ship, astern. Others were, at the same time, getting fire-hoses fitted and passed to the scene of the fire. The fire, however, continued to increase, and attention was directed to the ammunition contained in the powder-magazines, which were situated one on each side the ship immediately above the fire. The starboard magazine was soon cleared. But by this time the whole of the after-part of the ship was so much enveloped in smoke that it was scarcely possible to stand, and great fears were entertained on account of the port magazine. Volunteers were called for, and came immediately, and, under the guidance of Lieutenant Hughes, attempted to clear the port magazine, which they succeeded in doing, with the exception, as was supposed, of one or two barrels. It was most dangerous work. The men became overpowered with the smoke and heat, and fell; and several, while thus engaged, were dragged up by ropes, senseless.

¹ Her Majesty's troop-ship *Birkenhead* was wrecked on a reef of rocks in False Bay at the Cape of Good Hope, February 25, 1852. She carried 630 officers, men and seamen. Only 194 were saved after being adrift for several days. The rock on which she struck rose so sheer that the sounding at the bow showed two fathoms when that at the stern showed eleven. Deeds of the utmost bravery characterized the wreck, which made a profound impression on the British mind. A graphic account of the disaster may be found in the *Annual Register*, 1852, 470.—*Editor*.

"The flames soon burst up through the deck, and, running rapidly along the various cabins, set the greater part on fire.

"In the mean time Captain Castle took steps for lowering the boats. There was a heavy gale at the time, but they were launched without the least accident. The soldiers were mustered on deck,—there was no rush to the boats,—and the men obeyed the word of command as if on parade. The men were informed that Captain Castle did not despair of saving the ship, but that they must be prepared to leave her if necessary. The women and children were lowered into the port lifeboat, under the charge of Mr. Very, third officer, who had orders to keep clear of the ship until recalled.

"Captain Castle then commenced constructing rafts of spare spars. In a short time three were put together, which would have been capable of saving a great number of those on board. Two were launched overboard, and safely moored alongside, and then a third was left across the deck forward, ready to be launched.

"In the mean time the fire had made great progress. The whole of the cabins were one body of fire, and at about 8.30 P.M. flames burst through the upper deck, and shortly after the mizzen rigging caught fire. Fears were entertained of the ship paying off, in which case the flames would have been swept forwards by the wind; but fortunately the after-braces were burnt through, and the main yard swung round, which kept the ship's head to wind. About nine P.M. a fearful explosion took place in the port magazine, arising, no doubt, from the one or two barrels of powder which it had been impossible to remove. By this time the ship was one body of flame, from the stern to the main rigging, and, thinking it scarcely possible to save her, Captain Castle called Major Brett (then in command of the troops, for the colonel was in one of the boats) forward, and, telling him that he feared the ship was lost, requested him to endeavor to keep order amongst the troops till the last, but at the same time to use every exertion to check the fire. Providentially, the iron bulkhead in the after-part of the ship withstood the action of the flames, and here all efforts were concentrated to keep it cool.

"'No person,' says the captain, 'can describe the manner in which the men worked to keep the fire back; one party were below, keeping the bulkhead cool, and, when several were dragged up senseless, fresh volunteers took their places, who were, however, soon in the same state. At about ten P.M. the main topsail-yard took fire. Mr. Welch, one quartermaster, and four or five soldiers, went aloft with wet blankets, and succeeded in extinguishing it, but not until the yard and mast were nearly burnt through. The work of fighting the fire below continued for hours, and about midnight it appeared that some impression was made; and after that the men drove it back, inch by inch, until daylight, when they had completely got it under. The ship was now in a frightful plight. The after-part was literally burnt out,—merely the shell remaining,—the port quarter blown out by the explosion: fifteen feet of water in the hold.'

"The gale still prevailed, and the ship was rolling and pitching in a heavy sea, and taking in large quantities of water abaft; the tanks, too, were rolling from side to side in the hold.

"As soon as the smoke was partially cleared away, Captain Castle got spare sails and blankets aft to stop the leak, passing two hawsers round the stern, and setting them up. The troops were employed baling and pumping. This continued during the whole morning.

"In the course of the day the ladies joined the ship. The boats were ordered alongside, but they found the sea too heavy to remain there. The gig had been abandoned during the night, and the crew, under Mr. Wood, fourth officer, had got into another of the boats. The troops were employed the remainder of the day baling and pumping, and the crew securing the stern. All hands were employed during the following night baling and pumping, the boats being moored alongside, where they received some damage. At daylight, on the 13th, the crew were employed hoisting the boats, the troops were working manfully baling and pumping. Latitude at noon, 13 deg. 12 min. south. At five P.M. the foresail and foretopsail were set, the rafts were cut away, and the ship bore for the Mauritius. On Thursday, the 19th, she sighted the Island of Rodrigues, and arrived at Mauritius on Monday, the 23d."

The Nile and Trafalgar are not more glorious to our country, are not greater victories, than these won by our merchant seamen. And, if you look in the captain's reports of any maritime register, you will see similar acts recorded every day. I have such a volume for last year, now lying before me. In the second number, as I open it at hazard, Captain Roberts, master of the ship *Empire*, from Shields to London, reports how on the 14th ult. (the 14th December, 1859), he, "being off Whitby, discovered the ship to be on fire between the main hold and boilers: got the hose from the engine laid on, and succeeded in subduing the fire; but only apparently; for at seven the next morning, the *Dudgeon*, bearing S.S.E. seven miles' distance, the fire again broke out, causing the ship to be enveloped in flames on both sides of midships: got the hose again into play and all hands to work with buckets to combat with the fire. Did not succeed in stopping it till four P.M., to effect which, were obliged to cut away the deck and top sides, and throw overboard part of the cargo. The vessel was very much damaged and leaky: determined to make for the Humber. Ship was run on shore, on the mud, near Grimsby Harbor, with five feet of water in her hold. The donkey-engine broke down. The water increased so fast as to put out the furnace fires, and render the ship almost unmanageable. On the tide flowing, a tug towed the ship off the mud, and got her into Grimsby to repair."

On the 2d of November Captain Strickland, of the *Purchase*, brigantine, from Liverpool to Yarmouth, N.S., "encountered heavy

gales from W.N.W. to W.S.W., in lat. 43° N., long. 34° W., in which we lost jib, foretopmast, staysail, topsail, and carried away the foretopmast stays, bobstays and bowsprit, headsails, cut-water and stern, also started the wood ends, which caused the vessel to leak. Put her before the wind and sea, and hove about twenty-five tons of cargo overboard to lighten the ship forward. Slung myself in a bowline, and by means of thrusting $2\frac{1}{2}$ -inch rope in the opening contrived to stop a great portion of the leak.

"December 16th.—The crew continuing night and day at the pumps could not keep the ship free; deemed it prudent for the benefit of those concerned to bear up for the nearest port. On arriving in lat. $48^{\circ} 45'$ N., long. 23° W., observed a vessel with a signal of distress flying. Made towards her, when she proved to be the barque *Carleton*, water-logged. The captain and crew asked to be taken off. Hove to, and received them on board, consisting of thirteen men: and their ship was abandoned. We then proceeded on our course, the crew of the abandoned vessel assisting all they could to keep my ship afloat. We arrived at Cork Harbor on the 27th ult."

Captain Coulson, master of the brig *Othello*, reports that his brig foundered off Portland, December 27, encountering a strong gale, and shipping two heavy seas in succession, which hove the ship on her beam-ends. "Observing no chance of saving the ship, took to the longboat, and, within ten minutes of leaving her, saw the brig founder. We were picked up the same morning by the French ship, *Commerce de Paris*, Captain Tombarel."

Here, in a single column of a newspaper, what strange, touching pictures do we find of seamen's dangers, vicissitudes, gallantry, generosity! The ship on fire, the captain in the gale slinging himself in a bowline to stop the leak, the Frenchman in the hour of danger coming to his British comrade's rescue; the brigantine, almost a wreck, working up to the barque with the signal of distress flying, and taking off her crew of thirteen men. "We then proceeded on our course, *the crew of the abandoned vessel assisting all they could to keep my ship afloat.*" What noble, simple words! What courage, devotedness, brotherly love! Do they not cause the heart to beat, and the eyes to fill?

This is what seamen do daily, and for one another. Why is there not an ORDER OF BRITANNIA for British seamen? In the Merchant and the Royal Navy alike occur almost daily instances and occasions for the display of science, skill, bravery, fortitude in

trying circumstances, resource in danger. In the first number of the *Cornhill Magazine* a friend contributed a most touching story of the McClintock expedition, in the dangers and dreadful glories of which he shared; and the writer was a merchant captain. How many more are there (and, for the honor of England, may there be many like him!)—gallant, accomplished, high-spirited, enterprising masters of their noble profession! Can our fountain of Honor not be brought to such men? It plays upon captains and colonels in seemly profusion. It pours forth not illiberal rewards upon doctors and judges. It sprinkles mayors and aldermen. It bedews a painter now and again. It has spurted a baronetcy upon two, and bestowed a coronet upon one noble man of letters. Diplomats take their Bath in it as of right, and it flings out a profusion of glittering stars upon the nobility of the three kingdoms. Cannot Britannia find a ribbon for her sailors? The Navy, royal or mercantile, is a *Service*. The command of a ship, or the conduct of her, implies danger, honor, science, skill, subordination, good faith. It may be a victory, such as that of the *Sarah Sands*; it may be discovery, such as that of the *Fox*; it may be heroic disaster, such as that of the *Birkenhead*; and in such events merchant seamen, as well as royal seamen, take their share.

Would you see loyalty, implicit obedience and the complete acceptance of a law which is supreme? Where will you find them so absolute as in the eager intensity with which the scientist watches the face of nature to catch the slightest intimation of her will? Would you see magnanimity? Where is it so entire as in the heart of the true merchant who feels the common wealth surrounding his personal fortunes and furnishing at once the sufficient means and the worthy purpose of his becoming rich? Would you see self-surrender? Its noblest specimens have not been on the field of battle where the dying soldier has handed the cup of water to his dying foe. They have been in the lanes and alleys of great cities where quiet and determined men and women have bowed before the facts of human brotherhood and human need, and given the full cups of their entire lives to the parched lips of their poor brethren. We learned during the great war that the heroism of the President might be every whit as great and splendid as the heroism of the General. The enthusiasm of the truth-seeker may be as glowing and unselfish as the enthusiasm which scales the height and captures the citadel with the resistless sword.

There is nothing good or glorious which war has brought forth in human nature which peace may not produce more richly and more permanently. When we cease to think of peace as the negative of war, and think of war as the negative of peace, making war and not peace the exception and interruption of human life, making peace and not war the type and glory of existence, then shall shine forth the higher soldiership of the higher battles. Then the first military spirit and its works shall seem to be but crude struggles after, and rehearsals for, that higher fight, the fight after the eternal facts and their obedience, the fight against the perpetually intrusive lie, which is the richer glory of the riper man. The facts of government, the facts of commerce, the facts of society, the facts of history, the facts of man, the facts of God, in these, in the perception of their glory, in the obedience to their compulsion, shall be the possibility and promise of the soldier statesman, the soldier scientist, the soldier philanthropist, the soldier priest, the soldier man. "The sword is beaten into the ploughshare, the spear into the pruning-hook." "The war-drum throbs no longer, and the battle flags are furled." But it is not that the power of fight has perished: it is that the battle has gone up on to higher ground, and into higher light. The battle is above the clouds.—*From Phillips Brooks' Sermon before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston.*

The cause of peace is not the cause of cowardice. If peace is sought to be defended or preserved for the safety of the luxurious and the timid, it is a sham, and the peace will be base. War is better, and the peace will be broken. If peace is to be maintained, it must be by brave men, who have come up to the same height as the hero, namely, the will to carry their life in their hand, and stake it at any instant for their principle, but who have gone one step beyond the hero, and will not seek another man's life; men who have, by their intellectual insight, or else by their moral elevation, attained such a perception of their own intrinsic worth, that they do not think property or their own body a sufficient good to be saved by such dereliction of principle as treating a man like a sheep. If the rising generation can be provoked to think it unworthy to nestle into every abomination of the past, and shall feel the generous darings of austerity and virtue, then war has a short day. Whenever we see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, we may be assured it will not be one that invites injury; but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the bottom of the heart of every man, even of the violent and the base; one against which no weapon can prosper; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race and has the blessings of mankind. . . . In this broad America of God and man, where the forest is only now falling, and the green earth opens to the inundation of emigrant men from all quarters of oppression and guilt,—here, where not a family, not a few men, but mankind, shall say what shall be,—here, we ask, Shall it be War, or shall it be Peace?—*From Emerson's Essay on War.*

If a thousandth part of what has been expended in war and preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries past of its terrors, its sufferings, its impoverishment and its demoralization, but what was learned from history.—*Horace Mann.*

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.—*Longfellow.*

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. See No. 6, Part V.
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD
Part IV. EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD.
Part V. REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS.

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid	\$0.60
AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid	1.65
DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+220 pages. Postpaid	.60
THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid	.55
THE FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid	1.65
FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid	3.50
THE FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid	.65
THE GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid	.55
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid	2.20
INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid	2.40
MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid	1.00
THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSH. 8vo, xiii+462 pages. Postpaid	.90
PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+180 pages. Postpaid	1.65
SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid	1.40
TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid	2.20
THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid	1.65
WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid	.60
WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid	.60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By Leo TOLSTOY. 6½ x 4½ in., 50 pages. Postpaid	\$0.10
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6½ x 4¾ in., 82 pages. Postpaid	.15
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 76 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid	.10
A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid	.10
ORGANIZE THE WORLD. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 7¾ x 5½ in., 36 pages. Postpaid	.10
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6¾ x 4¾ in., 125 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 132 pages. Postpaid	.20
WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 107 pages. Postpaid	.20

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE

ADDRESSES AT THE MOHONK CONFERENCES ON
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION
1910 AND 1911

BY
HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

October, 1912, No. 7, Part II

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. See No. 6, Part V.
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD
Part IV. EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD
Part V. REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS

October, 1912

- No. 7. Part I. HEROES OF THE SEA. By W. M. TRACKERAY
Part II. THE FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE. By Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN

Without Serial Number

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

THE FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE.

ADDRESS AT THE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, 1910.

BY HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

I have been trying for a number of years to arrange to be in this place at one of these Conferences, and I esteem myself fortunate that this meeting was held at a time that exactly fitted into my plans. I am not sufficiently acquainted with your program to know what phases of this question have been covered or what subjects are to be treated by those who speak after me. Yet we are all so different in method of expression and in mode of thought, even when we are one in purpose and desire, that each, viewing it from his own point of view, can present just a little different line of thought from others.

I thought that I would speak of the forces that are back of this movement, for one cannot understand the strength of a movement, nor can he judge of its permanency, unless he knows the reasons back of it. In law school we read the maxim, "He knoweth not the law who knoweth not the reason thereof." So he cannot accurately judge of the strength of this movement unless he understands that back of it are forces which are universal, which are continuous in their operation and which are irresistible. My faith in this movement rests upon the belief that the forces back of it must of necessity bring it to triumph, and faith is in itself a great motive power. One cannot please God, we are told, without faith, and I think that is a very conservative statement. I think I might make it stronger than that, and say that without faith it is not only impossible to please God, but impossible to do anything else of importance. Unless one believes, he cannot act with enthusiasm, nor can he lead others to believe. If I were going to define eloquence, I would say it is the

speech of one who knows what he is talking about and means what he says. It is only when one speaks from his own heart to the hearts of others that he really moves people or persuades them or leads them to act, and he must himself have faith if he would induce others to believe.

To have faith, one must build upon a sure foundation. Those who believe in the coming of the day when nations shall not rise up against nations and when peoples shall learn war no more,—those who look forward to the coming of this day have faith, and they have something for the faith to rest upon. All the great forces of the world make for peace. The intellectual progress of the world cannot be downed, and there is not a nation in the world in which there is not intellectual progress. The number of schools is increasing constantly; the attendance upon the schools is increasing yearly; the standard of education is rising every year. That is true in this country, in every state in this country; it is true on this hemisphere and in every country on this hemisphere; it is true in the Eastern world and in every country there. Now, if it be true that everywhere there is intellectual progress, if it be true that everywhere the minds of men are becoming unfettered, if it be true that everywhere people are rising intellectually and taking a larger survey of their relations to the world, it must necessarily follow that with this intellectual growth there must come a greater demand for peace; for, the more intelligent a man is, the more clearly he discerns that might cannot make right, the more clearly he discerns that no moral question can be settled by force, and that where force settles a question it is only a temporary settlement, and, if it is settled on the wrong side, it simply means that there will be accumulating protest until a new settlement is undertaken. The best force, therefore, that makes for peace is the world's intellectual progress. I might add that in these assemblies we see the evidences of that fact, because we find great educators, intellectual lights, raising their voices in behalf of peace; we find those persons who are foremost in the educational world giving of their time and of their thought for the promotion of peace. This is true not only here, but everywhere. If there were no other evidence of the coming of a world-wide peace, we could find sufficient proof of it in the one fact alone that the world is growing more intelligent; and we can believe that, in proportion as it grows more intelligent, it will substitute brain methods in the settlement of difficulties for the physical-force methods that have been employed in the past.

But there is another force that works for peace. It is the progress of the world toward popular government, and this is just as marked and just as universal as the progress of the world in education. All over the world you will find that government is being brought nearer to the people; that all over the world the power of the individual is increasing; he is asserting himself more and more. First we had the monarchs who reigned without limitation, then we had the monarchs who reigned with limitation, then we had the few who ruled over the many; but year by year the heights are being brought down and the valleys are being raised, and man is more and more becoming a man "for a' that." The power of the individual is an increasing power, and you cannot find a country that has not at this time, that has not at all times, a controversy in which democracy,—and of course I do not use it in any partisan sense, but in the broader sense in which we are all democrats,—in which democracy is on the one side and aristocracy on the other. In this world-wide and continuous contest between aristocracy and democracy, democracy is gaining and aristocracy is dying; and with this growth of popular government there must necessarily come the discouragement of war. Kings used to use their people merely to secure fame and honor and wealth for themselves. The burden of war has always been upon the masses, and the time was when they could not protest against being slaughtered to advance some person's personal interest. But with the growth of popular government, with the increasing voice of the masses in government, there comes a rising protest against war and a rising demand that peaceful methods shall be substituted for violent methods. In war the masses bear the burden; the children of the masses die upon the battlefield, while the glories of war and the profits of war go to the very few. I say, therefore, that the second great force that lies back of this peace movement is the growth of popular government.

But there is another force, and I am not sure but it is a stronger force than either of those I have mentioned. It is the moral growth of the world. Let no one think that the world is getting worse. The world is getting better, and that is not only true here, but it is true all 'round the world. There is more altruism in the world to-day than there ever was before, and there is more altruism in this country than in any other country that ever was or that is to-day. If any one doubts the altruism in the world, let him investigate what is going on in the world. Let him stop counting his money for a while,

and see what those people are doing who are spending money instead of making it, who are more interested in finding out what money will do than they are in finding out where they can get some more, and he will find that altruistic influences are reaching out and are girdling the world. He will find that this nation is at the very head, and that this nation is spending more money per capita outside of this country in an unselfish interest in humanity and for the advancement of the world's welfare than any other nation in the world or any other nation that the world has ever known. But we have no monopoly on this. I speak only of our primacy, and, when I speak of our nation being ahead, let no one from any other nation take offense. It is necessary that our nation shall lead to avoid a just censure, for this nation has received from the world as no other nation has ever received, and if it be true that much is required of those to whom much is given, then our nation must, if it remember its obligation, give more than any other nation has ever given. Every nation in the world has contributed to a greater or less extent to our triumph, to our growth and to our greatness, and we should be worthy of the severest condemnation if we did not, in gratitude for what we have received, give abundantly of our abundance. I repeat that there is a moral progress in the world; there is a recognition of the doctrine of brotherhood such as has not before been known.

About five or six years ago I ran across a letter that was written by Dumas about fourteen years ago. He said that we were on the eve of a new era, we were on the eve of the era of brotherhood; that the world was about to be seized with the passion of love; that people were going to love one another as they had never loved before. Tolstoy read this letter of Dumas, and two years after the letter was written by the great Frenchman the great Russian indorsed the doctrine, and said that he, too, saw the signs of the coming of this day. Within the last ten years I have seen evidences of it. I might give you one. Ten years ago we had scarcely a men's club in the churches, —I say scarcely, I do not mean to say we had none at all, but few compared with what we have now. Within ten years Bible classes have been formed in almost every church of prominence. And this is true not only of the various branches of the Protestant Church, but there is progress along this line in the Catholic Church as well. All of the churches are bringing their men in; they are getting their men to study. Go to the book-shelves; go to the catalogues and see how many books are being written to-day on the one subject of the

application of religion to life, and you will find that never before has there been such a scrutinizing of the individual's acts and such an effort to make his life conform to his professions.

I believe that this movement is more than a national one. I went three years ago to the first meeting of the National Brotherhood of the Presbyterian Church. They had about one thousand delegates there at the first meeting. At the second meeting they had about fifteen hundred, and at the third about two thousand. And it is only a few years ago that that first meeting was held. Following the formation of the brotherhood in the churches, all of these denominations are now linking local organizations together in great national organizations. We have here one (Dr. Francis E. Clark) who is identified with a great movement; I can also say with whom a great movement is identified. I attended a Christian Endeavor Society last year at St. Paul, and I found there an immense gathering representing some two millions and a half. The growth of this is significant. The growth of the Young Men's Christian Association is equally significant. I think I am entirely within the truth when I say that more money has been raised to support the Young Men's Christian Association in the last ten years than was raised in the preceding fifty years. I mention these as some of the evidences.

This peace movement is another evidence. It is an outgrowth, a symptom, an illustration; and to this awakening sense of brotherhood I look for mighty results in the spread of this movement. I would say, therefore, that back of this peace movement there are three mighty forces: the world's intellectual progress, the world's growth toward popular government and the world's recognition of the doctrine of human brotherhood. Now, as naturally and necessarily follows, there are different ways of expressing this desire for peace; there are different ways of securing peace, or, I might better say, of attempting to secure it. We do not all think alike. When we agree as to the end, we differ as to the means of reaching it. Regarding the family—if you attend a meeting where they discuss how to train children, you will find that some will believe that you ought never to use the rod; others will tell you there has been no change from the old doctrine, "Spare the rod and spoil the child"; and yet they are equally anxious to improve the child,—a difference merely as to how to get at it or to reach that desired end.

I went to a meeting a few years ago and I heard a speech made by an eminent scientist of Europe. He gave an argument in favor of

peace I had never heard before, and I doubt if I shall ever hear it again. He said he was opposed to war because it was not in harmony with the theory of the survival of the fittest; that war killed off the strongest instead of the weakest, therefore he was opposed to it. I am glad to have anybody help in peace, no matter what his reason is, glad to have his influence on the right side, no matter upon what he bases his argument. I think, though, that more of us believe that war is bad because it kills *anybody*, whether strong or weak. We will get all the people we can to help bring peace on the theory that it is bad to kill anybody, and, when we get up pretty near to getting peace, there may be enough of those others who think war is bad because it kills the strongest to make a majority, and we will be grateful to them if they will come in and help. So you will find two schools of thought as to the best way to bring about peace.

I attended a peace meeting the other day at which there was one other speaker besides myself, and he spoke first. He advocated the large navy plan of bringing peace,—that we could promote peace better by standing in a position where we could tell a people that, if they did not do this or that, they had better. Well, they are honest, just as honest as we are, and they seem to be more numerous just now than we are. That is another reason why prudence would dictate that I say they are as honest as we are. I would not like to believe that there are as few people honest as agreed with me. I am bound to believe that there are a great many honest but misguided people who ought to agree with me. I am anxious to have these people who believe in coercing peace, who believe in peace with a swaggering accompaniment,—I am glad to have them help all they will, and I hope they will help a great deal. It is barely possible that they may get the armaments so large in some nations as to make it impossible for them to support the expenses of war. That is possible; but there is no reason why we should not work on the other line at the same time, so that, while these people with all their honesty and good sense are trying to scare the world into peace, I think some of us at least ought to stand for the doctrine that we may love the world into peace.

I do not want to say that those who differ from us cannot find Bible authority, for, unfortunately, people have found Bible authority for almost everything; but I find Bible authority for our idea. It is good doctrine, it comes from the highest source; it not only comes from the Bible, but from Christ himself, who said, "So

let your light shine before men; that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father." Christ placed the emphasis upon the example, upon the influence of the uplifted life; and I know of no way of judging nations except to apply to nations the rules that we apply to individuals. I know of no limitation that can be placed on a moral principle. I know of no moral principle that applies to one human being that does not apply to a group, no matter how large it is. I do not understand how a nation can become great except upon the very plan that the Almighty has laid down for us to build greatness on, and it seems to me that there is infidelity in the idea that we cannot afford to do right till somebody else joins with us. You cannot tell what good an example will do until you set it. You cannot tell, except by testing it, what influence will go out from an uplifted life; nor can you tell till you try it what influence will go out from a nation that sets an uplifted example.

I believe in these international meetings; I believe that our people ought to be represented and that we ought to try to get agreements with nations to do the things that are good. But I do not believe this nation ought to wait for any other nation to agree to do what is right. It ought itself to do what is right. I have faith in what I understand to be the Bible plan of bringing about peace.

Suppose we had two men here who differed, honestly differed, as to the method of bringing peace among men. I would suggest this plan of testing the two plans on a small individual scale, that we might then judge as to how it would apply on a large scale. I would say to these two men to put their plans into practice. Let one of them strap revolvers round him, and announce that he stood ready to avenge any insult, and he would bring peace by fighting for it. Let the other announce that he did not intend to do injury to anybody, that he would assume that nobody was going to do injury to him, that he was not going to arm himself; and he might go even further, and announce that he would promise in advance not to resist any violence attempted against him or to punish any man or any woman who struck him. Which one would have the fewer scars at the end of ten years? My friends, if this nation announced to the world that it would not spend its money getting ready for wars that ought never to come, that it would rather try to prevent the coming of war, that, as it did not intend to go out as a burglar, it would not equip itself with burglary tools, that it had faith in the good intent of other people, and it expected other people

to have faith in its good intent, do you think our nation would suffer for that?

Some one has said here—I believe it was the distinguished president of Columbia University—that, whenever there is an appropriation to be made for battleships, it is preceded by vociferous expression of a profitable kind of patriotism,—the spending of money for battleships. I am glad he said it. Every time there is something good to be said that is strong, I am always glad somebody else has said it, so I can quote it,—I am so conservative! Whenever I wish to make a radical expression, I always look for some man who stands higher than I do, and, if I can find that he has said what I want to say, then I can say it and hide behind authority. So I am glad that one of these college presidents says a thing like that, because I can now quote from him, and it will be more effective than if I said it first; but what he said was so.

We have a navy league in this country; they have one in Germany; they have one in Great Britain; and they have one in France. These navy leagues play one nation against the other. Whenever we build a battleship, the picture of it is published in the literature of all the other countries, and the building of that battleship is urged as a reason why all the other nations should build at least one more, and possibly two. Then, when they get scared and build, we get the picture over here, and we must build another. That is exactly what goes on and what has been going on for years. We are expected to get scared whenever another nation builds a battleship, and then we are to build two and scare them until they build three, and we get scared again and build four. That is exactly what is going on, and I am satisfied that President Butler put his finger upon the cause. It is this profitable patriotism that finds money in the building of ships and getting ready for war; and then, as soon as we get our ships built, the very same forces will forget their patriotism and, if they get a chance, build ships for other nations to beat our ships. I have sometimes used this illustration: Suppose there was a large lake, and suppose that there were half a dozen landowners, with their lands bordering on this lake, living peaceably together, without trouble or sign of trouble. A man who builds ships goes to one of them, and says: "You are very foolish: you are living here with no protection whatever. Don't you know that any of these men around you might build a battleship and come here, and you are absolutely defenseless? Now let me build a ship for you, and you

will get ahead of them." Suppose the man was foolish enough to take the advice. Just as soon as that ship was built, the shipbuilder would go to the next neighbor, and say: "Why, don't you see that man over there has got a battleship? What has he got that for? Do you suppose he is building it for nothing? Have you any doubt he has designs on you? Where else can he use it except on this lake? You had better get ready. Now I can build you two." And, if this man is foolish, he would build two. Then what an argument the shipbuilder would have when he got to the third man! "Why, there are two of them against you. They might combine, and you are absolutely defenseless." Now with that argument he could go all round that lake, and, after building ships for each one, he could go back to the first one, and say: "You are out of date. Look at the improvements since you built. And then you have only one, and these other people have four or five or eight apiece. There is nothing for you to do but mortgage your land. Now you are in for it!" Now that is the race of the world, my friends,—that is the mad race of the world.

My friends, the building of these great battleships, these preparations by Christian nations to fight one another, is a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world; it is infidelity to the doctrine taught by the Founder of the Christian religion. Christ taught no such doctrine; he taught us the power of love, not the power of the sword; and those who have tried to put into practice this doctrine are the ones who have suffered least from the use of force.

I suppose that the most significant example in all this world to-day of one who lives as he preaches this doctrine of love is the case of Tolstoy. He is not only a believer in the doctrine of love, but he is a believer in the doctrine of non-resistance, and there he stands proclaiming to the world that he believes that love is a better protection than force; that he thinks a man will suffer less by refusing to use violence than if he used it. And what is the result? He is the only man in Russia that the czar with all his army dare not lay his hand on. Those who have gone out preaching the doctrine of force in Russia have gone into isolation, while Tolstoy stands there and waits for them to come; but the power that is about him, the power that is over him and the power that is in him is proof against violence. I believe it would be true of a nation. I believe that this nation could stand before the world to-day and tell the world that it did not believe in war, that it did not believe that it was the right way to settle disputes,

that it had no disputes that it was not willing to submit to the judgment of the world. If this nation did that, it not only would not be attacked by any other nation on the earth, but it would become the supreme power in the world. I have no doubt of it, and I believe that the whole tendency is toward that policy. I believe that our nation can take a long step in advance now by announcing doctrines of this kind,—announcing that its navy will not be used for the collection of debt; that, as we do not imprison people for debt in this country, we will not man battleships and kill people because they owe people in this country; that we will apply to international affairs the very doctrines we apply to our national affairs, and, if any one in the United States wishes to invest money in another country, he must do so according to the laws of that country and be subject to the authority of that country. Then every nation would be open to American investment; for that is the kind of investment they would look for. They have had enough of investments which are preceded by the purchase of a little land to be followed by a battleship that takes the rest of the country. I believe that from every standpoint this would be a proper thing.

I believe that, if our nation would announce to the world that it stands ready to enter into a treaty of peace with every other nation, big or little, that, whenever there is any dispute which is beyond diplomatic settlement, that dispute shall be submitted to an impartial tribunal for investigation and report,—if our nation did that, it would not be a year's time before we would have treaties of peace of that kind with the leading nations, and in two years' time with practically all nations. And, when this nation had entered into that kind of treaty of peace with other nations, we would find the example such that it would result in treaties being made between other nations, and the day of war would be past.

Every time we talk about arbitration, they say, "But there are some questions that affect national honor, and you cannot submit that kind of a question to arbitration." The trouble is that, whenever a nation wants to fight, it manufactures a question of honor. It is like the old doctor who said, whenever he was asked to treat a disease which he did not understand, that he could not treat that disease, but he could give the patient something that would knock the patient into fits, and he was death on fits! So, my friends, whenever a nation wants to go to war, no matter what the subject is, it turns it into a question of national honor and goes to shooting. If we

could have an investigation of every controversy that is not settled by diplomacy, we would separate the question of fact from the question of honor, and I think, when the questions of fact were settled, we would generally find there was no real question of honor.

I am very glad to have had this opportunity of meeting with you. I am glad to join with you in an effort to advance a movement in whose ultimate triumph I have absolute confidence. When one is working for something which he believes is right and for something which he believes will triumph, he is not so particular as to the exact date of the triumph. A man who is trying to get something that he knows to be wrong must get it right away, for he knows, if he does not get it soon, he cannot get it at all; but, when one works for something he believes to be right, he knows that every hour will increase the chances of his triumph, for he believes that back of truth stands God with an arm strong enough to bring victory to his side.

THE HOPEFUL OUTLOOK FOR PEACE.

REMARKS AT THE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, 1911.

I am not here to-day to take part in discussions, but I could not resist the temptation to stop off for a few hours when I found it was possible to do so. And I have been abundantly repaid for my coming in what I have heard. I think that about the only thing I need say is that this is a period of congratulation more than a period of preparation. In fact, I feel that the treaty* which has been substantially agreed upon and which has been briefly outlined in the papers is so important a factor in the securing of that for which we are all hoping that it is going to render some of our work unnecessary, and I feel a good deal like one who is at the end of a contest when the result is known and he only awaits the announcement. I believe that this treaty, if the outline presents what the treaty contains, is the begin-

* President Taft's arbitration treaties with Great Britain and France.

ning of the end of war. Heretofore there have been exceptions in our treaties, and the exceptions have been the difficult things to deal with, because, when people are excited, they are likely to imagine that the cause which arouses them comes within the exceptions of the treaty. When people are mad, they talk about what they *can* do; when they are calm, they talk about what they *ought* to do; and the difficulty is that, when people are mad, they see no part of the treaty except the exception clauses. I have been worried as I have heard the reports of the work on this treaty. For instance, in Washington a little over a month ago, I read in a paper that the treaty would cover *practically* all questions. I have spent about twenty years of my life helping to write platforms, and "practically" is one of the words I have had to fight all my life. I think that Mr. Roosevelt spoke once of a weasel-word. I never heard the phrase before. I think he said he quoted it from some one else, but it is a very happy phrase. The weasel-word is the word that is put into a phrase to suck the meaning out of other words. When I saw that word "practically," I understood what it meant, because, of all the weasel-words, I know of no other word that has been as weasel-like as "practically." And then I saw a statement in the Chicago paper that the first clause of the treaty would provide that all questions would be submitted to dispute *except* those that involved the vital interest of the nation, the honor of the nation, the independence of the nation and questions where third parties were interested. And then I wondered why they did not save words and enumerate the things that were to be submitted and not the exceptions. But when I saw what was announced later, and apparently with authority, as the substance of that treaty, I found that, while the matters to be arbitrated did not include all matters, *all* matters without exception were to be investigated. And I regard that as the most important part that we have found in any treaty. I am not afraid of war after investigation: I am afraid of war before investigation. I am not afraid of war deliberately entered into: I am afraid of war commenced in passion, the war that is undertaken because something has been done that arouses resentment and before the peace forces of a nation have a chance to be felt and heard. Somebody shoots, and then we have to kill two persons because one has been killed; and then the other side has to kill four because two have been killed; and we proceed until finally one party is so embarrassed that an outside friend suggests that it is time to stop and get ready for another war. That is what has been going on,

and then a treaty provides conditions which inevitably lead to further dispute, because, instead of settling the question upon justice, they settle it by force,—and no question is ever settled by force. Might cannot make right, and no question is permanently settled until the settlement appeals to the sense of justice in the human heart.

Now this treaty, which provides that all questions will be submitted for investigation, to my mind closes the door to war. And I am here to rejoice. I believe we have taken a great step in advance, and that this treaty which has been practically agreed upon between our country and Great Britain will become the basis upon which other treaties will be made. It has already been announced that it has been presented to France, and naturally so, for France has been the historic friend of the United States. And, speaking for myself, I would not have been in favor of any treaty with any country that we were not willing to make with France. But I believe that the attitude of our nation should be that we are ready to make with *every* country any treaty that we are ready to make with *any* country. Yesterday morning's paper announced that Germany had been notified that this treaty could be made between Germany and the United States. I suppose that they are giving this to us by "peace" meal for fear we are not strong enough yet to take it as a whole. I presume by to-morrow morning we shall be notified that Japan has also been included in this arrangement,—and I hope so. Not that I desire to lessen the circulation of the sensational press, but I think that we have had enough talk of war with Japan, and that we can now lay aside any prejudice that the war talk may have aroused and recognize that there never was any more danger of war with Japan than with any other country. But, with the pending treaty as a model, I believe that we can now proceed and make treaties with every other nation of the world. And I have no doubt that England will proceed to make this kind of a treaty with other nations, and that other nations will then make treaties back and forth until the world will be held together by these contracts which will make war so remote a possibility that even the companies that make armor will no longer be able to support lobbyists at the Capitol to point out the necessity for great battleships.

My only regret is—and it is a regret based upon my pride in my nation—that our nation did not stand forth before any other, and make this proposition to all nations, and thus win a deserved place as the leader of all the peace forces on this earth. As an American, I would like to have seen our nation, blessed as no other nation has

been blessed, protected as no other nation has been protected, and in a position to do what no other nation was in a position to do, assume this leadership. I would like to have seen this nation rise to the responsibilities of its position, and, without waiting for any nation, announce that it was willing to put God's doctrine to the test and see what influence example would have upon the nations of the world. But we did not do it. We waited until the other English-speaking nations joined with us, and thus the honor will be shared; but I think the other nations will so quickly join that we shall all have the credit together, and that in a few months there will be no great nation that will stand before the public and risk the arousing of public sentiment by refusing to enter into this kind of agreement with any and all other nations.

There are still many things to do that will make the resort to war, and even to arbitration, less frequent than it is now; and I take it for granted that our forces will now be directed toward the work of cultivating a spirit that will settle questions even before they are submitted to any institution. I have been very much interested in what I have heard this morning concerning the broad scope of the work of the Carnegie Endowment as outlined. There is one part of its work that I suppose will be treated later,—that of the education of the public. Now I believe in publicity; I believe that the best thing that you can do for an error is to make it stand out where it can be seen, and that one of the things which that department should do is to investigate the influences that have been back of war and war scares; I think it would do this country some good to have an investigation of the things that have continually projected wars by the people as dangers to be feared. I have my views as to the cause, and I would like to have enough information to assure you here of the correctness of those views. I believe that one of the difficulties has been with papers that put the making of money above interest in their country and that think more of a big scare headline than they do of a nation's peace and the friendship of nations.

I have had some illustrations of that in this recent anxiety over the situation in Mexico. I was irritated when I found that a minister of Mexico happened to be in the United States and was besieged by reporters who attempted to get interviews out of him in regard to what he thought our country ought to do, or what it had done, and what his country would do if our country did so and so. It seems to me that their questions as reported were a violation of the good will that ought to exist between neighboring nations. But I think I

reached the limit of impatience when a representative of a news agency hailed me as I stepped out of an automobile in Detroit, and said, "We have just received a dispatch from Arizona that ex-President Roosevelt has arranged to raise a regiment in case of war with Japan, and we want to know whether you will raise one or not." I have reported to you exactly what the man said. I said, "Mr. Roosevelt has made no such arrangement." He said, "Yes, we have a telegram to that effect." I said, "You ought to verify a dispatch like that before you publish it." He said, "We have." I said, "No, Mr. Roosevelt has made no such arrangement." "But," he said, "if he has, will you raise a regiment?" Now, my friends, I want to ask you, what do you think of the desire for news that must animate a news agency that will spread a report that the ex-President of the United States is so sure that there is to be war with another nation that he has made arrangements to raise a regiment in case of the war? Such a report as that would naturally be telegraphed to the other nations, and, if they judged men by ordinary standards, they would think, "Well, surely, when an ex-President of the United States makes arrangements for raising a regiment, the people over there must think war is near at hand." I give that simply as an illustration. And I think it would be well to have some light thrown upon this cause for the war scares.

But I think the most influential cause of the war scares that are used to keep up this desire for a large navy is this pecuniary interest of the men who make battleships; and I would like to have some investigation of the amount of money that is spent every year in cultivating this sham patriotism that is manifesting itself in all the nations where they have navy leagues. We have a distinguished gentleman here from France. He will correct me if I am mistaken, but I have seen statements attributed to the navy league of France. I have seen statements attributed to the navy league of Great Britain, and of Germany; and, my friends, I would like to know who puts up the money. We find that the navy league of each country plays the other countries against its own nation, and, whenever a battleship is built anywhere, its pictures are spread before people as the reason why the country in which this navy league is operating should have more battleships. I believe that is a part of the educational work that needs to be done,—that light should be turned upon this and force these men, who are wrapping the nation's flag about them while trying to plunge their hands into a nation's pocket, to stand forth in their true mercenary character.

Then I think a third phase of educational work is illustrated by what is being done by the distinguished citizen of France who honors this meeting with his presence. It was my pleasure to meet Baron d'Estournelles de Constant about seven years ago, the first time I visited his city, and it has been my pleasure to renew acquaintance with him since. I was gratified when I learned that he was making a tour of the United States. I believe that the influence in this country of men like him talking of the interests of international peace is enormous. We are so constituted that we gather enthusiasm from one another, and, when one stands up whose heart is full of his subject and who speaks directly to the hearts of others, we sometimes realize something in us the presence of which we hardly knew. And he has awakened a multitude of our people who are for peace and have been for it all the time, only they have not had occasion before to express themselves upon the subject. When he speaks before an audience and the audience applauds, those who have not been interested catch the spirit of the meeting, and the more timid ones are made bold by the boldness of the bold. This is another great educational influence.

But, my friends, I have not time to discuss this question. I only arose to express my gratification at the progress that has been made, and to congratulate you upon the part that this Mohonk Conference has had in it. It is difficult, when we see a result, to know of all the causes that have entered into it; but this has been one of the molding influences of this country; it has been one of the organizations that has persistently, in season and out of season, brought before the attention of the country the fact that war is brutal and that civilized man should settle his disputes by reason and not by force. And this Conference has helped to raise the sentiment among the people and to lift the moral and the ethical standards as they relate to peace.

I believe that hereafter our work, as I suggested in the beginning, is largely the cultivation of the sentiment that will remove the causes that have heretofore led to war; and I will mention three things that I consider important.

First, I believe that we ought to cultivate sentiment in favor of including war loans with the things that are now prohibited; that is, that we shall no more loan money to people to carry on war than supply arms and ammunition with which to fight. I know of no reason why the money-changers of the world should be allowed to sit back and make money out of carnage when other people are prohibited from doing so. I think it is only the overpowering influence of the

dollar that has led the world to consent to it up to this time. It is a good time to cultivate a sentiment against placing the dollar on any other basis than other things used as war material. Second, I believe we ought to cultivate a sentiment against having the navy of a country used under any circumstances for the collection of the debts of people. We would not allow a man's life to be taken because he owes his fellow-men, and I think the time ought to be here now when we can declare to the world that we will not consent to shoot people of other countries merely because they may owe somebody in our country. Back of it all lies the doctrine that a dollar is worth more than a man; the doctrine that the love of money is the root of evil; for, when we get down to the bottom of war, we find that back of war is usually the desire to get some material advantage. And, third, I believe, my friends, that back of all our present peace movements must be the cultivation of a higher ideal, of a sentiment that will put human life above the things that man handles. Man, the creature of the Almighty and placed here to carry out the divine decree, is superior to any material thing; and, in proportion as the world can be brought to understand that man stands above everything else, we will find less and less cause even to take questions before arbitral courts; and along this line I believe this Conference will have a great work before it. Even when we have treaties that reach our highest expectations, there is the work of preparing the hearts of men to accept the only doctrine upon which peace can permanently rest, and that is the doctrine of human brotherhood, the doctrine of love for man to man; and, when the world recognizes that doctrine of brotherhood and recognizes the kinship that each should feel to every other, we will not kill one another in order to get that which other people possess that we may want.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid	\$0.60
AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid	1.65
DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+229 pages. Postpaid	.60
THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid	.55
THE FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid	1.65
FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid	3.50
THE FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid	.65
THE GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid	.55
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid	2.20
INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid	2.40
MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid	1.00
THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSH. 8vo, xiii+462 pages. Postpaid	.90
PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+180 pages. Postpaid	1.65
SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid	1.40
TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid	2.20
THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid	1.65
WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid	.60
WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid	.60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By LEO TOLSTOI. 6¼ x 4¾ in., 50 pages. Postpaid	\$0.10
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6¼ x 4¾ in., 82 pages. Postpaid	.15
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 76 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid	.10
A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid	.10
ORGANIZE THE WORLD. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 7¾ x 5½ in., 36 pages. Postpaid	.10
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6¼ x 4¾ in., 125 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 132 pages. Postpaid	.20
WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5¼ in., 107 pages. Postpaid	.20

World Peace Foundation
Pamphlet Series

**FOREIGN MISSIONS AND
WORLD PEACE**

ADDRESS AT PORTLAND, MAINE
OCTOBER 10, 1912

BY
SAMUEL B. CAPEN
President American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

October, 1912, No. 7, Part III

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. See No. 6, Part V.
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD
Part IV. EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD
Part V. REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS

October, 1912

- No. 7. Part I. HEROES OF THE SEA. By W. M. THACKERAY
Part II. THE FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE. By Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN

Without Serial Number

- THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living
THE GRANGE AND PEACE. Report adopted by the National Grange, 1909

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29A Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

FOREIGN MISSIONS AND WORLD PEACE.

BY SAMUEL B. CAPEN.

In the thirteen years since you called me to be your president we have considered together many phases of the foreign missionary problem, especially with reference to the home base. I come to you to-day with an entirely different question, but one which is very much upon my heart and which seems to be more timely now than ever before, the question of "Missions and World Peace." I bring this matter before the Board at this time because the work of all missionaries is being hindered by the preparations that the Christian nations are making for possible future wars between themselves, and their readiness to strike a weaker and a non-Christian nation. This is of especial importance to the American Board, for more than one-half of our missionaries are in the war zone, 203 in Turkey, and 126 in China.*

CHRISTIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST THE EAST.

Many heard Mr. Shuster, when he returned last spring from Persia, tell of his personal experiences and of the conflict in that unhappy country. Mr. Shuster called special attention to the fact that all three of the cases of spoliation and tyranny which have shocked the conscience of the world in these recent months have been cases of the aggression of so-called Christian nations upon Mohammedan peoples.

These addresses of Mr. Shuster were emphasized by an article which appeared in the *Japan Advertiser* in Tokyo, from which I quote:—

The first act in the Persian tragedy is that the Persian people are guilty of the unpardonable crime of possessing a magnificent country with magnificent resources; and this crime constitutes the crime of crimes which Christian Europe, armed to the

* If I had had any misgivings about the timeliness of this subject, it would have been dispelled by the addresses yesterday and to-day from the missionaries from China, Japan and Turkey. In the case of the latter country the people believe that the attack of Italy is more than a war of one people upon another, even an attack of Christianity upon their religion.

teeth, can neither condone nor overlook. From the danger signals that are already flashing forth it is easy to foresee that the victory of Russia and England over Persia will not only mean the subjugation of a practically unarmed nation by two fully armed powers, but the present triumph, if it does come, will surely contain an aftermath, which will have to be reaped by the victors. The world is accustomed to associate Russia with a merciless and despotic barbarism. The case will, however, be different for England, one of the two makers of the Persian tragedy. British prestige must undoubtedly come out of this transaction heavily besmirched; and in the backbone of England's empire, India, British justice must come to be looked upon askance and British reputation must suffer as it has never suffered yet. It is well also that missionaries and supporters of Christian missions to the "heathen" should know that the Oriental mind now defines Christianity as battleships, cannons and rifles devised and constructed for the plunder of the earth, and that the bleeding figure on the cross which missionaries hold up to the view of non-Christian peoples gets blurred out of their sight, for on their horizon looms largely the figure of the armed robber with cannon and rifles leveled threatening "your country or your life."

Then there has been the attack of Italy upon Turkey, which has aroused the conscience of the civilized world. Turkey said in substance, "We will submit Italy's grievance to any tribunal that nation cares to name and abide by the results." This Italy refused, and practically asked to have Tripoli handed over in twenty-four hours. We can well appreciate the evil results which come to all our missionary work from such events as these. The missionary is put upon the defensive to explain why so-called Christian nations should be guilty of such high-handed proceedings.

The eyes of the world are upon the new Republic of China; but how have the Christian nations in the past treated that old Empire? In 1840 she destroyed some chests of opium, and then England compelled the Chinese, against every principle of justice, to admit opium into all her ports. In 1896 Russia compelled Japan to give up Port Arthur, and subsequently took it herself. In 1897 two German Catholic priests were killed in a riot in the Shantung province. Out went the German fleet and took Kiao-chau Harbor, a large section of country, the right to develop all mines and railways in that province, and a large indemnity besides. Soon after this England stepped in and helped herself to Wei-hai-wei. She had already taken Hongkong as an indemnity after one of her opium wars. France moved up from Annam; and so it has gone on until China, with a coast line as long as from Eastport, Maine, to the Panama Canal, has hardly a harbor left.

Then, in 1900, after the noted Boxer uprising, an indemnity of

\$333,900,000 was imposed. The payment was to be distributed over thirty-nine years, and the total sum payable was \$728,820,704. That is China's experience with Christian nations! In Tung-chou alone, a city where the Chinese made no resistance against the allied armies and where there was no fighting, 573 Chinese women of the upper class committed suicide rather than live after the indignities they had suffered from the soldiers of Christian nations! An old Chinese missionary at Silver Bay last summer called our attention to the fact that there are 100,000,000 children in China needing to be educated, and the resources of the new Republic should be used for this important work. They greatly need a common education that will bind all classes in the Republic together and make it one united nation. Yet, yet, under the influence of the Christian nations, she is using her resources for developing a great army and navy to defend herself against the said Christian nations. Europe especially ought to hold down its head in shame at the sad results of its bad influence. Is it any wonder that all of the Western nations seem to many of the Chinese to be still "barbarians" because of their fighting? In the light of all this can we wonder that the *National Review* of China a few months ago should say that "Persia has been bullied almost to death, and Russian intriguers have supported her ex-Shah's attempt at a counter-revolution; that Morocco has been the cockpit of Europe for the past few months; that Turkey is now being driven at the point of the sword to commit national hara-kiri; that China is alternately clubbed on the head and stroked on the back by her dear friends in the north or across the water, with the Powers of Europe observing a cynical neutrality"? We rejoice to add to the credit of the United States that our relations with China from the days of Anson Burlingame have been almost without reproach, except for certain features of our exclusion laws. The Chinese recognize this, and it gives the American missionary the greatest opportunity that has ever come or that can ever come to this great nation which contains one-fourth of the human race.

THE ECONOMIC AND MORAL ASPECTS OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

In this world movement of what has been called "War against War" we see a great effort to prevent a further sapping of the life of the nations, and of directly and indirectly crippling their ability

to exercise their largest influence for humanity. Success in this effort would remove a great obstacle to missionary success. There is an economic as well as a moral aspect to this problem.

First. Take the *material*, or *economic*, side. It is a sad fact that 67 per cent. of the expenses of our Government are being expended either because of past wars or in preparation for possible future wars. It has been well illustrated by a man having an income of \$1,000 a year who is spending \$670 to pay for the expenses of former fights or in preparation for new ones, and is leaving himself only \$330 for house rent, food, clothing, fuel, education of his children, etc. Last year the figures show that the United States spent on preparations for future war a per capita of about \$3.33. Of this total sum we Congregationalists, therefore, have had to pay over \$2,250,000, or three times as much as we have given for foreign missions. The condition across the sea of course is worse than it is with us. The annual German expenditure is \$731,000,000, and of this \$318,000,000 is spent for war expenses in one way or another. It is stated that every farmer in Germany is burdened with the equivalent of the maintenance of six non-producing men in arms. Four million men are under arms in Europe at an annual expense of \$1,682,000,000, thus absorbing the life of these nations. If these conditions can be changed, and the fear of war removed by arbitration agreements, not only will the bulk of this immense sum be saved, but these men themselves could be returned to the ranks of peaceful citizens, and perhaps be able to earn as much besides. We need courts of arbitration and a world peace to save the nations in the social revolution that is going on. The world is full of labor strikes, and men ask for larger wages because of the increased cost of living. With total debts of about \$27,000,000,000 and an annual interest charge of nearly \$1,000,000,000, the nations of Europe are running into universal bankruptcy. All the nations of the earth are so closely interwoven that a disaster to Europe would be a tremendous blow to us, followed by a panic and disaster which would seriously impair all missionary enterprise. Not only that, but in order to keep up in the race our Government is increasing its battleships at an enormous cost. The Massachusetts commission on the high cost of living properly included militarism, and the waste and expense which is the natural result, as one of the chief causes. A modern battleship at a cost of \$12,000,000 amounts to more than the income of the American Board for a decade, and the annual expense of running it is equal to our total yearly

income. All this expense is a hindrance to the whole moral influence of our nation to the people on the mission field. The return by our Government of one-half of the Chinese indemnity and its use by China to educate students here in our colleges is worth more to bind China to us and make for universal peace than the presence of half a dozen battleships. It is well also to remember that, if President McKinley could have had his way, he would have preferred to go without any cash payment from China. His view, which he sought to impress upon others, was that a Chinese nation capable of doing business with the Western world was a far better guaranty of peace and progress than any sum which might be extorted from China as an indemnity for the Boxer outrage, and which bound her practically to international financial control.

Second. But this is more than an economic question: it has to do with *morals* and *religion*. Need I remind you that our Civil War cost this nation, including both North and South, about a million of men, and that the wars of Napoleon cost Europe three millions of men? The effect of this on Europe was that the nations have been repopulated in part by those who are physically weaker, for the best went into the army and had no offspring. It is said that the wars of Europe have reduced the stature of the French nation nearly two inches. We are no longer having the "survival of the fittest, but the survival of the unfittest." If that has been the effect of past wars, we note also the hates and the unholy ambitions that are now being fostered by the war camps of the world in keeping up an armed peace. In the light of all this we see how great the injury is to all our moral, religious and missionary interests.

OUR ALLIES.

In this effort for universal peace and the recognition of a brotherhood as wide as the world, our missionary interests will have many strong allies.

First. We have the great *commercial interests of the world*. It is an interesting fact that the recent arbitration treaties of President Taft were indorsed by about 200 boards of trade and chambers of commerce in cities containing 20,000,000 people. To show the world-wide interest of the business men in this great subject, at the Fifth International Congress of Chambers of Commerce held last month in Boston, the question of arbitration was given large

place by the foreign and American delegates alike as the most important question for them to consider. They recognized that all business and financial interests are thrown into chaos by anything that interrupts the peace of the world. This Congress was the most important meeting of business men that the world has ever seen. It was therefore a great moment when, under the leadership of the President of the Congress, M. Canon-Legrand, a resolution which he had drawn covering the whole field of international arbitration was passed with the greatest enthusiasm. On the impulse of the moment the members of the Congress sprang to their feet, some stood on the chairs and waved their hats. It was a great message of the commercial leaders of forty-five nations to the governments of the whole world. Few scenes more significant in human history have ever been witnessed.

Second. We have with us the great *labor interests*, for they recognize that in the case of war they would suffer the most because of the interference of business, the lack of work and the general unrest which is created. It is believed that the peace of Europe for the past thirty years has been due to the working classes of Europe more than to any other single cause.

Third. It is of special interest to know how the *men of the Grand Army* respond to this movement. I have rarely had a more interested audience than on last Memorial Day, when I delivered an address upon this subject before one of the posts of the Grand Army. These men recognize the truth of what General Sherman said, that "war is hell," and they do not wish others to endure what they had to suffer. Gallant General Sheridan has left his record also, that the world would settle its differences by arbitration. At the Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, last May, in some respects the most effective address was made by Admiral Chadwick, commander of the flagship in the battle of Santiago.

Fourth. We have a great propaganda going on in our *schools and colleges and universities*, and young people everywhere are beginning to recognize that it is more honorable for a nation to be great in peace than in war. A university is a far more glorious sight than a *Dreadnought*, and it will not be in the scrap-heap in twenty-five years.

Fifth. We also have with us not only the great peace societies of the world and all the influences which grow out of the Mohonk conference, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the World Peace Foundation, but we have the good will and oneness

which is growing up among the students of the world through the World Student Christian Federation and through the International Young Men's Christian Associations. Finally, one of the greatest in its power for good is the mighty work that is going on through world-wide Christian Endeavor. Here are 79,000 societies in a hundred denominations in practically every nation, with a membership of about 4,000,000 members.* Dr. Clark has shown anew his wonderful statesmanship in making, as a part of the work of this mighty movement, peace among the nations. Young people thus bound together all over the world are not easily going to fight one another to satisfy the wicked ambitions of their grasping rulers. It is stated that there has never been a movement which has made such rapid progress and taken hold of all classes in society in so brief a time as the movement to end war between nations and to substitute in its place universal arbitration treaties and a permanent Court of Arbitral Justice.

OUR ANTAGONISTS.

It is well for the missionary leaders not only to know their allies, but their chief antagonists, in this struggle for world peace. At the Conservation Congress in Carnegie Hall last April some of us heard Dr. J. A. Macdonald, of Toronto, speak in the place of W. T. Stead, who went down in the "Titanic" while on the way to this country to speak on world-wide peace. Dr. Macdonald had recently had in London an interview with Mr. Stead, extending late into the night, in which they discussed what they could do to break the power of the leagues in every nation that exist to keep up the war spirit. These leagues directly and indirectly are the greatest enemies to progress. They grow more bitter as they see the rapid advance of the peace movement. There are navy leagues in this country and in Great Britain, Germany and France, and these leagues play one nation against another. The picture of every warship built is published in other nations, and they are urged to build more and larger battle-ships, and so the waste goes on. In the French Assembly and else-

* At the European Christian Endeavor Convention held this summer at Christiania the subject of peace had a prominent part in the program, and the chief speaker was Dr. Raynvald Moc, the secretary of the Nobel Institute. There were nearly 1,000 delegates present from Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Finland, Hungary, Switzerland and other lands; and the convention passed the following splendid resolution:—

"The European Christian Endeavor Convention in Christiania, 1912, requests all the National Christian Endeavor Unions to present a petition to their respective governments and parliaments that the movement for arbitration in all conflicts between the nations, and mediation in all controversies at home, be promoted more energetically than ever, so that the Prince of Peace, Jesus Christ, may reign over the nations, and the growth of His kingdom be furthered among all men."

where the increase of our navy is given as a reason why other nations should increase theirs. We build more and they build more. They build more and we build more. An army leader has recently proclaimed publicly that war is the opportunity and duty of a great nation, and many newspapers gloat over the weaknesses of rivals, and write insulting articles to arouse the passions and keep alive the war spirit. It is always interesting to notice every time a naval appropriation bill is to come before Congress it is preceded by a war scare, usually with Japan. This noisy and frightened discussion has been well called by President Butler of Columbia University "profitable patriotism": we might call it "pulmonary patriotism"! It is said that in Great Britain one man in every five is interested directly or indirectly in the preparations for war either for the army or navy! No wonder the war scare is kept up by selfish interests, and the forces that make for righteousness will always have to fight the interests that make money out of human hate and strife.

Another foe is the "*jingo*" influence of minorities represented in the "yellow press." The German chancellor said in the Reichstag a few months ago that "wars are not planned and brought about in these days by governments, but noisy and fanatical minorities drive nations into war." The United States was driven into an unnecessary war with Spain in 1898 largely through the power of the "yellow press." Let me quote a few words from Mr. Root: "There are no international controversies so serious that they cannot be settled peaceably if both parties really desire settlement; while there are few causes of dispute so trifling that they cannot be made the occasion of war if either party really desires war. The matters in dispute between nations are nothing: the spirit which deals with them is everything." In 1915 we shall have lived a hundred years in peace with Great Britain, yet John W. Foster has pointed out that there have been eight differences with England each of which might have brought on war, had the spirit of war been the controlling thought. With the speedy completion of the Panama Canal the Pacific Ocean will become the center of the world's strategy. If there is to be a storm center anywhere, it will be there. The swift-going steamship and the cable have brought the East and the West together, so that the Pacific has become nothing but a ferry. We must treat as brothers the Chinese and Japanese nations. Missionary progress must not be hindered by wicked attacks and by war scares of the "yellow press."

THE DEBT OF DIPLOMACY TO THE MISSIONARY.

It is possible in the limits of this address to give but a few illustrations on this important subject. In the volume entitled "American Diplomacy in the Orient," by Hon. John W. Foster, there is this forceful sentence: "Up to the middle of the last century the Christian missionaries were an absolute necessity to diplomatic intercourse." Certainly, no diplomat of our day has had so wide an experience or has the right to speak with so much authority. This statement is corroborated by the Hon. William B. Reed, a former United States minister to China, who says, "I could not have advanced one step in the discharge of my duties, could not have read, or written, or understood one word of correspondence on treaty stipulations, but for the missionaries."

To begin with, we owe to missionary philologists nearly one hundred and fifty dictionaries, including Judson's and Stevens' for the Burmese, Morrison's and S. Wells Williams' for the Chinese, and Hepburn's for the Japanese. These are the basis of language and, of course, of all intelligent intercourse between the East and the West.

Dr. Peter Parker and Rev. E. C. Bridgman, missionaries to China, were made the Chinese secretaries of the Caleb Cushing embassy in 1844. Dr. Parker twice served as *chargé d'affaires* in China and as a commissioner to negotiate with the Chinese Government in 1856. Rev. Dr. S. Wells Williams was interpreter to Commodore Perry in his first visit to Japan in 1853 and afterward was secretary of legation in China.

W. A. P. Martin translated into Chinese Wheaton's "Elements of International Law," encouraged in this by our early great minister to China, Anson Burlingame, and Sir Frederick Bruce, the British minister. Dr. Martin also had translated Woolsey's "Elements of International Law" and two or three other similar works. Most of these were reprinted in Japanese, and have had large influence in shaping the international policy of two empires. They showed the public men that something besides force was recognized among Western nations in their dealings with one another.

Then there was the great work of the Hon. Chester Holcomb, a former missionary of the Board, who served as secretary of legation in China for many years, and who was a master of the Chinese language. Some of us have heard him tell of his work on treaties, every letter written with his own hand.

Dr. H. N. Allen by helping a wounded Korean prince helped to open Korea to the missionaries, and then he himself was appointed American minister to Korea by two Presidents.

Both China and Japan recognize the greatness of the service of the missionaries, in whom they have had perfect confidence. As evidence of this, the *Japan Mail* has said, "No single person has done as much as the missionary to bring foreigners and Japanese into close intercourse."

Sir Charles Warren, governor of Natal, has said: "For the preservation of peace between the colonists and the natives, one missionary is worth a battalion of soldiers."

When we think of this subject, one of the first names that comes to our mind is that of Rev. Dr. John H. DeForest, one of our great missionaries to Japan, who has left us so recently. He not only had the entire confidence of the Japanese officials, who honored him in many ways, but he had also the confidence of the diplomats of the Western nations. He did great service only a little while before he died in his defense of Japan against the attacks of the "yellow press" and of others,—a service which did much in a critical hour toward making public sentiment in the right direction. The great service which he rendered in promoting peace between the nations was recognized by the American Peace Society, which made him one of its vice presidents, and by the emperor of Japan, by whom he was decorated.

May I repeat again the incident which some of you may have heard me mention before, but which is so perfect an illustration of this subject that I venture to repeat it here? Nearly four years ago about fifty gentlemen were invited to meet together at a home in New York City to pay their tribute of regard to a gentleman who had once represented our nation officially in one of the great capitals of the Old World, and who was going out again to represent our Government in a position of high trust. After several gentlemen had commended him for the good work he had been able to do in the past, he told them the secret of his power and influence in diplomatic matters. He had been often invited to meet with the ambassadors of the great Powers to discuss great international questions. When very complicated matters arose, he always asked for a week's time to consider them, and it was always granted. During the week he went over the situation confidentially with three men living in this capital, and, after obtaining their opinion, he went back to the

conference, and gave his judgment, which was always accepted. Two years ago at the World's Missionary Conference in Edinburgh I met a gentleman at a social gathering, and alluded to this incident. To my surprise he replied, "The British ambassador was in the habit of consulting these same three men." The gentleman was quite familiar with the facts, for he was also a representative of the British Government in an official position. The interesting part of this incident is that the three men who were thus consulted by the representatives both of the United States and of Great Britain had all of them held a commission of the American Board. Here, then, were three of our men who, through the representatives of the United States and Great Britain, were helping to shape the diplomacy of the world at one of the most important world capitals. One of these ambassadors has been known again and again to send for one of our missionaries to advise with him upon important state matters, once even summoning him in the middle of the night because of the gravity of the question that had to be considered on the morrow. Different officials in our State Department have also spoken of their obligations to our missionaries for information. It is easy to see how this may be. The minister or the consul is subject to change every few years, and often he does not know the language of the country to which he is accredited. The missionary, on the contrary, lives on in the same community twenty, thirty, and sometimes forty years. He knows the people, their language, their modes of thought, their traditions, their history. He has a mass of information of inestimable value that he can communicate to any government official.

We have time for only one more illustration, and it is found in the story of the new Chinese Republic. There was great danger of war between the North and the South, which, if it had started, might have involved the peace of the world. Edward S. Little, a former missionary, now a business man and the honorary treasurer of the United Society of Christian Endeavor of China, came to the front as peacemaker. He sent a proposal to Yuan Shi Kai and to Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the president of the Provisional Republic, suggesting that they appoint a commissioner to consider terms of peace, with the further offer of his own home at Shanghai as a place for holding this peace conference. The plan was approved, and two commissioners were appointed. The home of Mr. Little was given up for this purpose for six weeks, he serving often as "middleman," according to Chinese custom in harmonizing differences. The wonderful

success of these commissioners was the saving of China from a bloody conflict. Let us not forget that much of this success was due to this Christian business man, a former missionary, who by his years of faithful service in missionary and philanthropic enterprises had won for himself universal confidence.

Furthermore, it must never be forgotten that it was because Dr. Sun and so many of his compatriots were trained in our missionary schools and had come under the Christian influences of the West that the success of this wonderful movement for better government was made possible.

The nations are beginning to realize more and more what they owe to the missionaries. A Chinese leader was asked "when the recent revolution began," and with great wisdom he replied, "The day Robert Morrison landed in Canton." We must not forget the forward look in this summary. There are in the Protestant missionary schools of the East nearly 1,300,000 students of all grades under missionary training. In these schools are being shaped the future leaders of every nation. The work done by our missionary teachers in training Chinese students has been one of the largest factors in helping to bind China to us. What is true in China is true elsewhere, and is to become more and more true as the schools for Christian education are being rapidly increased. It is these students of to-day, the leaders of to-morrow, that are to bind this world together.

There would have been no new China or Korea or India or Turkey if there had been no missionaries, and the diplomacy of the world would have been powerless without their aid. Western civilization, with its accompanying evils, is everywhere crowding into the East: it is the Christian missionary, educator and physician, that serves as the antidote to all these evils and shows what Christianity is. It is the missionary who has been the peacemaker, and it is his influence that is making possible a closer oneness between the nations.

THE UNITED STATES A WORLD POWER.

In this struggle for world peace our missionaries have a great asset in the influence of the United States as a world power. We sometimes talk as if this began at the time of the Spanish War. That is not really true. In the eyes of the world it may seem so because the nation then became more conspicuous, but we have always been a world power because we have usually stood for righteousness and

for the rule of the people. The history of the world since the establishment of our nation is the proof of this. Look at South America and the British colonies; look even at Great Britain herself, as she has moved so steadily forward along the line of democratic ideas; look at Japan and Turkey and China, and see how we have influenced other nations in the direction of democracy.

A GREATER WORLD AND MISSIONARY POWER.

We have thus seen that the American missionary for the last fifty years has been the greatest power in bringing the nations of the Near East and the Far East into closer touch with the nations of the West.

We have also seen that the influence of all missionaries is being seriously hindered by the so-called "armed peace" of Europe and by the increasing expenditure of these nations in preparation for war. This evil and hindrance seems to be increasing every year as the nations are struggling to increase the strength of their armies and the size of their navies. I think it is also evident that the United States, from its position, its history and its freedom from alliances with other nations, is the most powerful single missionary unit in the world.

Facing now the future, it is vital, therefore, for our missionary influence that the touch and impact of the United States upon the Orient shall be more and more Christianized. I believe it is true that, if our nation would take a stronger position in its moral leadership along the lines of arbitration and world peace, the power of every American missionary would be doubled. Only a few idealists cared for these things at first. Not until our generation has it really taken hold of the people as a whole. It is becoming now a part of the great missionary and philanthropic movement of our day. God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth; every man is a brother of every other man,—all have been made alike in God's image. Every human being has infinite possibilities, be he black or brown or red. Modern missions have shown that people in no country are so degraded that they cannot be saved. The cannibal of yesterday can become the Christian leader of to-morrow. The world is beginning to see, and our missionary interests must take part in declaring, that men must no longer be slaughtered, that duels between nations must cease, for they are both inhuman and unchristian. When the world Powers are burdened to the breaking point by preparations

for war, and all our missionary interests are hindered and in part neutralized by the warlike plans of all Christian nations, the American Board and the churches whose servant it is should bring their influence to bear upon international life in the movement toward world-wide peace.

Our nation will attain its truest grandeur if it will aid our missionary interests by assuming more strongly than ever a moral leadership in behalf of justice and righteousness and fair dealing in all the world. We ought to try to make every nation feel that other nations are their friends, and not their enemies, and that the Ten Commandments are as workable and as important between nations as between individuals. The churches of the Christian world are giving money by the millions every year to make a better Orient. They have a right to insist that their work shall not be hindered and sometimes undone by the wickedness of our commercial interests, the selfishness of our politics or the grasping of the territory of a weaker by a stronger nation. The Baroness von Suttner, in an address in the First Congregational Church in San Francisco a few weeks ago, said, in speaking upon international peace, that Americans are fifty years in advance of Europe ethically. We want the United States and its statesmanship to be "born again" into a still larger service for every nation, and to be ready for any program which will make for brotherhood and world peace.

FOUNDATIONS LAID FOR INCREASED POWER.

The foundations for this were laid in these latter days by Secretary Hay, who made the world see that American diplomacy had but two controlling maxims, the "Golden Rule" and the "open door." The brilliant tenures of office of Mr. Hay and Mr. Root have given our nation wonderful prestige. There may be others here who were present in 1904 at the great Universal Peace Congress in Boston. When Secretary Hay spoke, every one was conscious that, figuratively, the ears of the governments of every nation in the world were listening at the telephone to hear what he had to say,—the whole world was his audience. In a similar way, when President Taft made his memorable address a few months ago, proposing to include in his pacts for international arbitration with England and France even questions of national honor, thus going farther than any other great statesman had ever gone, he in turn caused the whole world

to listen. That address and that proposal made possible a wonderful session in the British House of Commons, and the impressive words of Sir Edward Grey marked the occasion as one of the most momentous in recent years. Certainly, all nations should be in sympathy with the "anti-conquest resolution," introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman McCall of Massachusetts. This resolution authorizes the President to instruct the delegates of the United States to the next Hague Conference and the Pan-American Conference to express to these bodies the desire of the United States "that in all treaties of arbitration, amity and peace to be negotiated by the signatory powers in the future, a preamble be inserted by which the powers mutually recognize their national independence, territorial integrity and absolute sovereignty in domestic affairs, and that they will not seek to increase their territories by conquest, and to endeavor to secure a declaration to that effect from the conferences." It is believed that, if this principle could be adopted by the powers, it would do more than almost anything else to bring about a limitation and reduction of armaments and make possible conditions of universal peace and a permanent Court of Arbitral Justice. What we need is to arouse the moral conscience of our nation, and especially our great missionary interests to support more strongly these utterances and efforts of our great leaders.

A CLOSER TOUCH WITH THE ORIENT.

Nothing could bring us into closer touch with the Near East and the Far East than for our mission boards to take an advanced position in this great world-wide movement. Turkey, chafing under the feeling of wrong that has been done to her by Italy, is in a mood to enter thoroughly into sympathy with such a plan. China has always been opposed to war. Confucius taught her people that nations, as well as individuals, should settle their differences by appeals to right and justice. In the spirit of that teaching the soldier has for generations been considered inferior to the farmer or the business man. After Japan was opened by Commodore Perry to the knowledge of the West, she was shocked by the bloody history of the Western world. One of their great moralists begged the Japanese Government for the privilege of going on a mission to the West, that he might plead with these nations to put an end to bloody wars which two hundred and fifty years of peace had made so

distasteful to Japan. Of greater importance still is the statement made not long ago at Mohonk by Professor Honda that "Japan's boundless ambition, whatever her mistakes and shortcomings, is to be behind no other nation in doing the right thing in the right way." The present vigorous Japanese Peace Society, with some of the leaders in our Kumiai churches as officers, and the American Peace Society of Japan, composed of resident Americans, show how strongly the peace idea is rooted in our sister nation.

In the province of Manchuria there is a great cemetery which the Japanese have consecrated to the burial of the Russians who died in the battles in that vicinity. When the Russian army retreated, they left thousands unburied: the Japanese army collected every bone and every bit of uniform and every broken weapon that they found upon the field of battle and buried all with military honors. The graves of the soldiers have been marked with iron crosses in the Greek form, and those of the officers with similar crosses of white marble. When the cemetery was dedicated, Russian ecclesiastics and military commanders were invited to share in the ceremonies. It has been well pointed out that it was fifty years after the battle of Gettysburg before we invited our brothers in the South to meet us where they fought with the men of the North, there to thank God together for a united country. What took fifty years for us to do, the Japanese have done in five years. A nation that can forgive as Japan has forgiven and show it in this beautiful act has certainly caught the spirit of Christ and taught us a lesson to which we may well give heed. Well may we call the men of such a nation our brothers, and so live as to come into a closer bond with them among the nations of the earth.

THE GOOD WILL OF OTHER NATIONS.

In this work we have the good will of other nations as one of our largest assets. We are so situated on this continent with the great oceans between us and other nations that we can easily be a leader for world peace. It is significant that at a recent meeting Sir Edward Grey told Dr. Mott and Mr. McBee that it was possible for our nation to take the initiative in matters like these, because we are free from all entangling alliances and therefore our motives would not be questioned or our suggestions be open to suspicion. No nation has ever had such an opportunity as ours, and no time in our history

has been so propitious for pressing this great question as the present moment, when we are beginning to plan for the great celebration of a hundred years of peace with Great Britain, and when the program for the third Hague Conference is about to be made up.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT.

The present policy of great military and naval expenditures by the Christian nations is a travesty on our Christianity. When Dr. David Starr Jordan went to Japan last year as a representative of the World Peace Foundation, he was cordially received by that nation. But it was significant and just that the press of that country should criticize the conditions which prevailed in lands which, while holding great peace congresses and sending out peace workers, continue to increase their own equipments for war. It is all-important to have international conferences and treaties, but I believe that, if our nation would, without waiting for any other, take the initiative and call a halt in our great expenditures for naval armament, the world would soon follow us. *We are strong enough to do what is right.* Who is going to attack us? Not England, whom we love to recognize as our "mother country"; not France, who gave us Lafayette and other leaders in the war of the Revolution, and who has never ceased to be our friend; not Germany—why should she cut off her hundreds of millions of dollars of business with us, her best customer across the sea, and threaten revolution within from her business, manufacturing and labor interests? not Japan, whose people, as a whole, love us as their best and most faithful friend, who know also that they could not safely add to their present burdensome debt, and that the hour of conflict with us would be the hour for Russia to recapture Port Arthur and Korea. The men who try to stir up strife between our nation and Japan or any other nation are guilty of high treason. I am not unfamiliar with the argument that an increasingly stronger navy is an assurance of peace. But there is another side to this; namely, the temptation there is to provoke a quarrel in order to use these ships. Colonel Gädke, a German military officer of acknowledged authority, has recently said, "It is only partly true that armaments are the insurance premiums of peace: with better right they might be called a constant menace to peace." Von Moltke many years ago said in the Reichstag that it is mutual distrust which keeps the nations in arms

against one another. Can any one imagine anything that will more surely create distrust than to be continually adding battleship to battleship? Our navy kept efficient at its present size is large enough for all purposes of defense; and the thought of anything besides defense in connection with it is wicked.

GREATNESS IN SERVICE.

The early months of this year saw a great series of meetings all over our country in the interests of the Men and Religion Forward Movement. In all these meetings, emphasis was put as never before upon the social service of the church. We have come to a new day in this regard. In the generations preceding ours the emphasis was put upon the individual life, and the thought seemed to be largely of a future salvation. But to-day we are recognizing the message of Jesus for society as a whole and for the world of to-day. While never forgetting our individual responsibilities to God, we are recognizing now that our churches have duties to society and to all the nations.

Jesus taught that, for every individual, greatness consists in service. What is true of the individual is true of the nation. Nations are spending money by the hundreds of millions for armies and navies in the belief that that is making them great. Let the United States teach the world that it is the soul, the heart, the purpose, the ideal of a nation as of an individual that makes it great. Wars, as a rule, do not decide moral questions: they only decide which nation is physically stronger. That which will make this nation really great is *service to every nation*. How shall we serve? By increasing our navy and thereby saying to the world that armies and navies are power? No, brute force is not the greatest power: the mightiest power in the world to-day is not force, nor ambition, nor fear, but *love*. Write it large, LOVE; and the mightiest expression of that love was on the Cross. The United States will do its largest service for the nations by showing its love and good will, and by taking the leadership in bringing the nations to mutual confidence and trust and love each to the other. The present effort for a permanent arbitral court and for world peace is an effort to make our Christianity practical to every nation. What is the use to preach the angel song of "good will," unless we cease our preparations for war? Mr. Beecher used to tell of men who "prayed cream and lived skim milk."

That is what the Christian nations in large measure are doing to-day. *Service then, I repeat, for the whole world by the mighty power of love should be the mission of our nation.* When we prove this more and more by our national policies, then will every missionary of this Board and of every Board have his power and influence doubled, barriers and partitions will be removed, and we shall hasten the fulfilment of the angel song of nineteen centuries ago, "Peace on earth, good will to men," by making it a present reality.

THREE GREAT WORLD MOVEMENTS.

We have come to a critical hour in the world's history. Let me speak of three of the great world movements which promise much in the advancement of the kingdom of God. The first is looking toward the closer union of the various branches of the Christian Church, the outlook for which has never been so bright as at the present time. The union of work in the foreign field is showing what is possible here at home. A united church which would strike a common blow everywhere for Christ and humanity would double the present power of the church, divided as it now is.

The second movement is that of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference, which is making a scientific study of the whole mission field, not only to see how the position of the present forces may be better adjusted, but also to ascertain what forces of men and money are needed to preach the gospel in the unoccupied fields to the millions who have not yet heard of Jesus Christ. There is a growing feeling that the churches' gifts of money and life are pitifully small in proportion to the greatness of our wealth and of our opportunity. It is hoped that, when this committee reports, it will submit a plan large enough to lead to the putting up of the money and the putting in of the men that shall make possible the planting of the cross of Christ everywhere in this generation, and thus conquer the world for him. This is to be the challenge to our united churches.

But back of these and before these and as a basis of these there is a third movement. That there may be a united church, and that there may be this oneness of operation, we need first to remove all national hatreds and jealousies by a plan that will provide for the settlement of every international dispute by arbitration, including those so-called questions of "national honor," to the end

that great standing armies and navies may be abolished, except to the extent that they may be necessary for police service. Every missionary enterprise in the world will halt and hesitate till this is done.

One of two things will happen at an early day. The crushing debts of the nations will lead to bankruptcy and disaster and panic such as the world has never known, or a great war will come which, because of its awful slaughter and expense, will in like manner impoverish the nations. In either case the incomes of all missionary organizations, home and foreign alike, would be so impaired that not only would all advance cease, but it might even be necessary to call home men at the front. A retreat instead of an advance—what a fearful object-lesson to the non-Christian nations! It is right for us to go on urging an increase in gifts of money and of life on a far larger scale than ever before, but at the same time we must not be blind to the awful peril that confronts every missionary interest to-day. A friend abroad this summer has been sending me quotations from the newspapers published there in smaller places, and they are full of words looking to a coming war. I have been reading, also, extracts from the debates in the House of Commons and in the French Chamber of Deputies. Some plan must be speedily consummated to relieve the burdens and tensions which are growing so rapidly among the nations, for the strain is too great to be endured for very long. We shall be false to the missionary interest we hold in trust—yea, more, we shall be false to him who is the Prince of Peace—unless we are more earnest and determined in this matter.

It is a great time to live, and these are great things for us to work for together. In hearty accord with the Christian forces of Great Britain and Germany and of every other nation, let us strive for the moral leadership of the world along the lines of universal peace and brotherhood. Then we shall be the better able to give effectively the glad news of our Christ to every one, everywhere. And we can have a great ally at once in the Far East. The new Emperor of Japan, following the long-established custom of that nation, has chosen the single word "righteousness" as the motto of his reign. It is a happy providence that his name translated into English is "Enlightened Peace." He recognizes in this noble act, what so many leaders of his people have felt, that Japan now needs to lay the emphasis upon high moral character, that she may be increasingly a world power among the nations. Let the United States and

Japan clasp hands over the ocean with the noble purpose of making our combined influence tell mightily for righteousness and peace around the world. The federation of the world for God and humanity, let this be the ambition, the purpose, the prayer of every patriot and of every Christian.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid	\$0.60
AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid	1.65
DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+229 pages. Postpaid	.60
THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid	.55
THE FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid	1.65
FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid	3.50
THE FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid	.65
THE GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid	.55
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid	2.20
INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid	2.40
MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid	1.00
THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSH. 8vo, xiii+462 pages. Postpaid	.90
PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+189 pages. Postpaid	1.65
SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid	1.40
TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid	2.20
THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid	1.65
WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid	.60
WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid	.60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By LEO TOLSTOL. 6½ x 4½ in., 50 pages. Postpaid	\$0.10
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6¾ x 4¾ in., 82 pages. Postpaid	.15
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 76 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid	.10
A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid	.10
ORGANIZE THE WORLD. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 7¾ x 5½ in., 36 pages. Postpaid	.10
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6¾ x 4¾ in., 125 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 132 pages. Postpaid	.20
WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 107 pages. Postpaid	.20

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

BY

EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

OCTOBER, 1912, No. 7, Part IV

Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1894

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid	\$0.60
AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid	1.65
DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+229 pages. Postpaid	.60
THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid	.55
THE FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid	1.65
FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid	3.50
THE FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid	.65
THE GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid	.55
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid	2.20
INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid	2.40
MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid	1.00
THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSH. 8vo, xliii+462 pages. Postpaid	.90
PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+180 pages. Postpaid	1.65
SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid	1.40
TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid	2.20
THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid	1.65
WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid	.60
WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid	.60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By LEO TOLSTOL. 6½ x 4½ in., 50 pages. Postpaid	\$0.10
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6¼ x 4¾ in., 82 pages. Postpaid	.15
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 76 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid	.10
A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid	.10
ORGANIZE THE WORLD. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 7¾ x 5½ in., 36 pages. Postpaid	.10
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6¾ x 4¾ in., 125 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7¾ x 5½ in., 132 pages. Postpaid	.20
WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7¾ x 5½ in., 107 pages. Postpaid	.20

THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT¹

BY EDWIN D. MEAD

The Bishop of Hereford, who came to the United States in 1904 to attend the International Peace Congress in Boston, has been emphasizing in England, in addresses since that time, the importance of the contributions of the United States to the peace movement. He has said that the United States itself is, in his judgment, the greatest and most influential peace society in the world, because it illustrates over a broader area and with greater power than is anywhere else the case the beneficent operation of the three great principles of interstate free trade, an interstate court, and federation, which are all that is necessary to extend to international affairs to give us precisely the kind of organized world that we want. He has also been telling his English brethren that he counts it a capital misfortune that they are not more familiar than most of them are with the writings of Sumner and Channing and the other great leaders of the peace movement in the United States during the last century. We in America know too well that this unfortunate unfamiliarity is not confined to Englishmen.

In discussing for the general American public the literature of the peace movement, and in commending to students the best books to read, there is really no better place to begin than with the considerations and the books which the honored Bishop of Hereford, the ablest and most influential champion of the cause among English churchmen, commends to his English friends. It would be hard to name two books devoted to the

¹ Reprinted, by kind permission, from the *Chautauquan*, May, 1909.

peace cause, which state the general case better than Sumner's "Addresses on War" and Channing's "Discourses on War," the two American volumes which the Bishop of Hereford refers to most conspicuously. Sumner's addresses especially, although the most of them were given more than half a century ago, remain to-day the most powerful impeachment of the war system, the most persuasive plea for international justice, and the most impressive history of the peace movement, which we have in equally brief compass. The volume of Sumner published in the International Library, which brings his peace addresses together, contains three of these addresses. The first was his Fourth of July oration in Boston in 1845, on "The True Grandeur of Nations"; the second was the address delivered four years later upon "The Abolition of the War System in the Commonwealth of Nations,"—an address which, while not so famous as the earlier address, is in many respects a more thorough and illuminating study; and the third is the address which he gave in many places in 1870, upon "The Duel between France and Germany," tracing the history and decay of the duel between individuals in civilization, and showing how war is the duel between nations, having much the same history, being grounded in similar prejudices and false ideas of honor, and destined similarly to pass away before the development of the spirit and institutions of justice. The student who masters these three memorable addresses will find himself at the heart of the peace movement, with its history well outlined and its problems clearly defined.

Channing's "Discourses on War" represent the highest position which has been taken by the American pulpit in this great crusade, and there is nothing which the ministers and members of Christian churches can more profitably read as declaring the right attitude of religious men concerning peace and war. They were the first noteworthy discourses upon the subject in our pulpit; and they have a further historical interest in the fact that it was in Channing's study in Boston, in the Christmas week of 1815, that the Massachusetts Peace Society

was organized, Channing standing side by side with Noah Worcester in the organization in its early years. One of the addresses included in the Channing volume published in the International Library is the tribute to the memory of Worcester. All of the discourses are informed by the clear and resolute thinking, moral fervor, and definite application of conscience to public affairs which inspired Channing's utterances in every field of social and religious life.

If the Christian Church and its ministers in America, as in the rest of the world, have not always done their duty as concerns war and the military spirit when the nation has been under temptation, but have too often followed the multitude to do evil, and have condoned and whitewashed wrong when wrong became dominant and fashionable, many of the ablest and most influential leaders in the movement for international justice have still been men in the pulpit. One can never forget such sermons as those of Theodore Parker, such essays as Bushnell's on "The Growth of Law," or such addresses as that by Reuben Thomas (published by the American Peace Society) upon "The War System in the Light of Civilization and Religion." The Nestor of the peace cause in America in this latest time was our revered preacher, Edward Everett Hale, and the students of the peace movement must not neglect his writings and general advice in behalf of arbitration and the better organization of the world. I think it was he who first said that the time was near when a nation which had a Secretary of War and no Secretary of Peace would not be considered fit for civilized society; and I think that it was his church which first organized a department of international justice as one of its regular instrumentalities. If I were to name the man in the American pulpit to-day who seems to me the Channing of the movement with us, it would be Charles E. Jefferson of the Broadway Tabernacle in New York. The learning, penetration, sharp exposure of fallacy, prophetic statesmanship, and religious uplift of his pulpit utterances and published papers upon peace and war during the last half dozen years have been noteworthy

indeed. All religious men should help extend their influence, and here they are commended to students of the movement at this hour. No one has more searchingly exposed the weakness and absurdity of the frequent claim that great armaments tend to preserve the peace, and no one has pointed out with greater power the constant and dangerous menace, especially to a republic, of a large professional military class. Mr. Jefferson's article, "The Delusion of Militarism," in the March number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, since reprinted in pamphlet form, well illustrates his pungency and power.

We must never forget the religious origin of the peace movement. As a distinctly organized movement it began here in America, and began with Christian men. The first peace society in the world was the New York Peace Society, founded in the summer of 1815 by David Low Dodge, and membership in the Christian Church was a condition of membership in that first peace society. We should doubtless all agree in accounting this an unwise condition, but it is indicative of the sacred character which those men attached to their cause. The Massachusetts Peace Society was founded at the end of the same year (1815) by Worcester and Channing, both of them Christian ministers. Both Dodge and Worcester had before this published arraignments of the war system. Dodge's "War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ" has been recently republished, with a biographical introduction, in the International Library; and Worcester's famous old pamphlet of 1814, "A Solemn Review of the Custom of War," which had an immense circulation and exerted a profound influence in its day, may be obtained for a few cents from the American Peace Society.

These two famous works by Dodge and Worcester are the early classics of the peace movement in America; and while Dodge's work is old-fashioned in its style and method, and both works lack that emphasis upon international organization which we find a little later in William Ladd, and which finally created the Hague Conferences, it is surprising how modern they are

in much, and how complete their impeachment still remains of the folly, waste, and wickedness of the war system. The most powerful recent impeachment of the system upon these grounds is Rev. Walter Walsh's "Moral Damage of War," an impassioned but also most detailed and definite work, first called out in Great Britain by the Boer War, but as salutary and necessary for Americans as for Englishmen to read. A passionate exposure of the war system of a quite different character, but equally impressive, is the famous story, "Lay Down Your Arms," by the Baroness von Suttner.

Immanuel Kant, in his great tractate on "Eternal Peace," published in 1795, just after the launching of the American republic, declared that universal peace and consequent disarmament would come, and come only, with universal self-government; because he believed that justice could come only with freedom, and peace only with justice. In view of this association, which I think is valid, of peace and international justice with free institutions, it was no accident by which the organized peace movement began in this republic. The Bishop of Hereford's judgment had historical as well as other grounds. It was not accidental, but logical, that the great founders of the republic, Washington and Franklin and Jefferson, should be conspicuous champions, in their time, of peace principles and international fraternity. Their utterances on this subject were memorable, and we do not recur to them half often enough. In my little work on "The Principles of the Founders," originally the Fourth of July address in Boston, 1903, I brought together many of these impressive utterances; and as I do not know of any other place where they are so easily accessible, I may be pardoned for referring to this. The words of Franklin, who went so far as to declare that "there never was a good war nor a bad peace," were the most important of these; and these words are brought together more fully, I think completely, in one of the Old South Leaflets (No. 162), "Franklin on War and Peace."

This is a fitting place to say that several of the Old South Leaflets are devoted to subjects relating to the history of the

peace movement, among them being the first book of Dante's "Monarchia," the introduction to Grotius's "Rights of War and Peace," William Penn's "Plan for the Peace of Europe," Elihu Burritt's "Address on a Congress of Nations," and The Hague Arbitration Convention of 1899. These leaflets are accompanied by careful historical and bibliographical notes, and as their cost is merely nominal, they are calculated to be of service to many.¹

I once gave a course of lectures to the Boston teachers at the Old South Meetinghouse on "Men who have Worked to Organize the World," with the following several themes: Dante's Dream of a Universal Empire, Henry the Fourth and "The Great Design," Hugo Grotius and "The Rights of War and Peace," William Penn's "Plan for the Peace of Europe," Immanuel Kant's "Eternal Peace," Charles Sumner and "The True Grandeur of Nations," and the Peace Conference at The Hague. It will be noted that this survey covers six centuries and representatives of six nations, witnessing to the fact that from the time of the first modern man, if we agree to call Dante that, to our time, prophetic men have been rising in successive centuries and in every land to preach the gospel of a united world, which gospel at last in our own day the Hague Conferences are reducing to law. Sumner's learned and powerful addresses, to which I have referred, present all of these great pioneers in their true places and relations. Greatest and most influential of all in the peace movement was Hugo Grotius, who, in his monumental work upon "The Rights of War and Peace," — of which Andrew D. White well said, in his pregnant address at Delft at the time of the First Hague Conference, that "of all works not claiming divine inspiration, that book has proved the greatest blessing to humanity," — founded the

¹ The Old South Leaflets, which are sold for five cents each, are published by the Directors of the Old South Work, Old South Meetinghouse, Boston. The International Library, frequently referred to here, is the important series of peace works published by the International School of Peace, 29 A. Beacon street, Boston.

science of international law. For the ordinary student of the peace movement, the introduction to this great work, reprinted in the leaflet mentioned above, will be sufficient; the more thorough student wishing to go further will find Whewell's translation the best.

It is an interesting coincidence that the great founder of the science of international law was a native of the land, so heroic during his own lifetime in the struggle for freedom, in which, two centuries and a half after his death, was to meet the first of those momentous Hague Conferences — forerunners of the real "Parliament of Man," if not indeed themselves to be regarded as the first sessions of that parliament — which have advanced in a measure not less than revolutionary the two great ends for which he labored, the amelioration of the cruelties of war and the promotion of international arbitration.

The literature of the peace movement in America for the seventy years following the founding by William Ladd in 1828 of the American Peace Society, in which the then existing local societies were merged, is interesting chiefly for its constant and remarkable anticipations of the Hague Conferences. Dr. Trueblood, the present secretary of the American Peace Society, has rightly said of William Ladd that he was "the man who saw most clearly the ripeness of the time and felt the necessity of bringing into coöperation all the scattered forces that had begun to work for the peace of the world, — a man who will one day be everywhere reckoned among the foremost of the creators of civilization." And James Brown Scott, one of the members of our American delegation at the Second Hague Conference, has said that all of the cardinal features of the Hague programme were fully and powerfully formulated by William Ladd sixty years before. Ladd's remarkable chapter in the volume of "Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations," published by the American Peace Society in 1840, should be consulted. The addresses of Elihu Burritt, above referred to, at the International Peace Congresses at Brussels and Paris in 1848 and 1849, repeat the great demands of William Ladd, — for a congress of nations, which

should develop and codify international law and create an international court to apply it. This was precisely, as will be recognized, the programme and problem of the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907; and it was popularly spoken of in Europe in the days of Ladd and Burritt as "the American plan."

The thought of supplanting war by arbitration and of constructive measures for the better organization of the world was by no means confined, in the long period between Dante's "Monarchia" and the call for the First Hague Conference, to the few great thinkers mentioned above. These names are only representative. Dr. W. Evans Darby, the secretary of the English Peace Society, has prepared a large volume entitled "International Tribunals," which is a collection of the various schemes which have been propounded through the centuries. The work is a monument of critical and painstaking research, and is made more valuable by the complete list and account which it contains of all the treaties or cases of international arbitration, beginning with the Jay treaty of 1794. The writings of Dr. Darby's predecessor, Henry Richard, hold a high place in the history of the peace movement in England. Two recent English books should be warmly commended: John A. Hobson's "Imperialism," which is the most searching survey known to me of those commercial tendencies and temptations which are the chief causes of war in our time; and Francis W. Hirst's "The Arbiter in Council," which, in a singularly skillful and cogent manner, in the form of a seven days' discussion by a group of friends, considers the present great international issues. A Washington friend recently wrote me that he distributed twenty copies of this impressive work as Christmas presents. He could not well have done better. There is no better English book on the subject. It is all the better because there is so much of the inspiration of Cobden in it. Of all Englishmen who have served the peace cause, Richard Cobden was the most powerful and the most influential, and his economic arguments have special force to-day. The careful student will not fail to read the speeches

and essays on peace and war in the four volumes of his published works, and those who have not time for this should at least read John Morley's *Life of Cobden*.

I make slight reference here to books not written in English, for I assume that most of my readers read only English. The peace literature of all the leading European nations is of great extent and value, and the most important existing bibliography of the movement is that prepared by Senator Henri Lafontaine of Belgium, the present president of the International Peace Bureau at Berne.

I have said that Grotius's "Rights of War and Peace" was the greatest single contribution to the movement for international justice. From Grotius's time to ours no other work has struck so powerful a blow at the war system as Jean de Bloch's "Future of War." As the result of almost unexampled research into present world conditions, Bloch with powerful reasoning brought home to the governments and peoples of Europe the bankruptcy and ruin to which they were hastening if the present system of war and crushing armaments were not supplanted by the legal and rational settlement of international differences. His startling work, published in 1897, was undoubtedly one of the promptings to the call of the First Hague Conference by the Czar of Russia the next year. The whole of this great six-volume work has never been translated into English, but the essential part of it is published in one volume in the International Library.¹

With the Hague Conference there opens an entirely new era in the peace movement. The nations have at last definitely and officially undertaken the task of organizing the world. The movement in the last ten years has described a course essentially like that described by the antislavery movement in the United States in the decade between 1850 and 1860. That movement for a generation had been a great moral movement; but because the evil which it confronted was so monstrous and menacing, it

¹ A pamphlet by the present writer upon "Bloch and The Future of War" can be procured from the American Peace Society.

inevitably became a political movement — and won. Never did the slave power seem so arrogant or strong as in 1852, at the beginning of its end. Never was the big navy craze, with its attendant extravagances, so monstrous and seemingly strong as at this hour. Yet the great armaments are doomed. The present Anglo-German situation is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the common silly argument that the way to insure peace is to multiply battleships. Every new *Dreadnaught* added to either the German or British navy is found to be, so far from a new bond of peace, a new occasion of friction and danger; and men are waking everywhere to the perception that all the monstrous navies are more a provocation than a defense, and that courts must take the place of armaments. The peace movement has become political, and twenty-five hundred members of the parliaments of the various nations are now leagued together in the Interparliamentary Union, coöperating in those measures which shall gradually supplant war by law.

Dr. Trueblood's "Federation of the World" treats the long and varied efforts of the past distinctly as leading up to the culmination at The Hague. Hon. John W. Foster's "Arbitration and the Hague Court" is a manual of the arbitration movement informed by the same spirit. Bridgman's "World Organization" is an impressive showing of the remarkable advance already actually made in the development of an international constitution, with judicial, legislative, and executive features. If there be among my readers some who have time now but for two books among the many mentioned here, let the two be Sumner and Bridgman.

The history of the First Hague Conference was written for American readers by Frederick W. Holls, the secretary of the American delegation; and the section relating to this conference in Andrew D. White's autobiography should not be neglected. An admirable work upon "The Two Hague Conferences," by Professor William I. Hull, has recently been published in the International Library, and this is the best work for the general reader. Professor James Brown Scott has brought together in

a handsome volume the texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague, including all of the conventions and related official documents, constituting an invaluable book of reference for the careful student. Among the valuable pamphlets published by the Association for International Conciliation are two upon the Work of the Second Hague Conference, by Baron d'Estournelles and Hon. David Jayne Hill, and by James Brown Scott; and these will be valued both by those who have not and those who have time for the larger works.

A body of literature becoming every year richer and of greater moment is that made up of the reports of the important Peace Congresses and of the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, which latter is undoubtedly the strongest organized force working to-day for the supplanting of war by arbitration and justice. The American Peace Society furnishes at trifling cost the reports of the two International Peace Congresses, which have up to this date met in the United States, — the Chicago Congress of 1893 and the Boston Congress of 1904; as also the larger and more costly report of our first National Peace Congress, the New York Congress of 1907, which was the largest peace demonstration yet seen in the world. Equally valuable is the report of the second Congress, at Chicago in 1909. The reports of the two memorable Conferences on International Arbitration held at Washington in 1896 and 1904 are of high importance, but now unfortunately to be found only in the large libraries. The annual reports of the Lake Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration (that of 1909 was the fifteenth) constitute a veritable library of information and vital thought upon this great cause, and these reports are generously furnished to students of the movement.

The American Society of International Law was initiated at Mohonk four years ago, and its able *Journal of International Law* is rich in articles of the highest value for every man concerned in the progress of world organization. At Mohonk also strong impulse was given to the movement for the notable new

work for peace in our schools and colleges, which already has a considerable literature. The yearbooks of the federation of the cosmopolitan clubs, which are multiplying so rapidly in our colleges and universities, are big with promise. The new American School Peace League has rapidly advanced to a position of remarkable usefulness and significance, and every teacher in the country should have its little manual, which may be had for the asking from the secretary, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston. Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead's "Patriotism and the New Internationalism" is a manual for teachers, prepared especially to help in arranging programmes for the observance of the 18th of May, the anniversary of the opening of the First Hague Conference, now, with the indorsement of the National Educational Association and the Association of School Superintendents, becoming so common in the schools. Mrs. Mead's compact little "Primer of the Peace Movement" is of service not only for teachers but for everybody else desiring to learn at a glance what the movement is, what it has already achieved, and what it is aiming at.

Nothing is more important here than to show the young people in the schools how our great American poets — Emerson, Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier, Holmes — have all been prophets of this great cause. Their inspired lines in its behalf constitute a precious section of the literature of the movement.

The remarkable deepening of devotion to the peace movement in the last ten years has given birth to many books touching special aspects of the cause with noteworthy penetration and power, which works cannot here be even enumerated. David Starr Jordan's "Blood of the Nation" and "The Human Harvest" reveal the frightful and paralyzing drain of the war system upon all the best forces and resources of mankind. Jane Addams's "Newer Ideals of Peace" shows how intricately involved are the problems of militarism with the pressing industrial problems which now everywhere confront the world.

Much of the literature of the international movement which is really of most practical and immediate value to many people

is not in the form of books at all, but in pamphlets and brief leaflets. I have referred to certain pamphlets on the Second Hague Conference, published by the Association for International Conciliation. This is an organization founded by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant of France. President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University is the head of the American branch of the association. The pamphlet publications of the latter are invaluable, already extensive, and rapidly multiplying; and these pamphlets and lists of them are sent freely to all persons applying to the secretary of the association (Substation 84, New York City). Andrew Carnegie's address on "A League of Peace," bringing out with power how, as the commanding cause of the preceding time was the war against slavery, the commanding cause of our time is the war against war, has had a circulation of hundreds of thousands. The American Peace Society publishes a great wealth of pamphlets on the Cost of War, the Limitation of Armaments, the Fallacies of Militarism, Reasons why Our Navy should not be Enlarged, the Truth about Japan, the Inter-parliamentary Union and its Work, the History of the Peace Movement in America, the Organization of the World, etc., — about which readers can learn in the pages of *The Advocate of Peace*, the able monthly journal of the society.

And this suggests my last word. It is that everybody who is really in earnest about this commanding cause of our time, everybody who really desires to keep informed about its progress and its literature, should join the American Peace Society (31 Beacon Street, Boston; there is a merely nominal fee of one dollar), if only for the sake of regularly receiving its journal. For here one will learn month by month of the latest things done for the cause the world over, of the significant debates and official actions at Washington and London and Paris and Berlin, of the programmes and proceedings of congresses and conventions, of every strong new speech or article or pamphlet or book. This, in a movement so vital and political as the peace movement, is imperative. It is important

indeed for the student of the movement to go into the library ; but it is most essential for him to keep in touch with the situation at the present hour. It is the critical hour in the history of the peace movement, when the decisive success of the organized effort inaugurated here in America in 1815 seems clearly within sight. The Third Hague Conference will meet in 1915 at the latest. It should meet two years earlier, and the United States should take definite and early initiative to that end. Two years before its meeting the international committee charged with the determination of the programme will meet. The scope and character of that programme will depend upon the world's public opinion. They will depend in large measure upon American public opinion ; and that opinion will depend upon the degree of intelligent study devoted to the situation by our people in the immediate future.

World Peace Foundation

Pamphlet Series

THE WASTE OF MILITARISM

From the Report
of the
Massachusetts Commission on the
Cost of Living, 1910

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
29A BEACON STREET, BOSTON

OCTOBER, 1912, No. 7, Part V

Entered as second-class matter, April 18, 1911, at the post office at Boston, Mass.,
under the Act of July 16, 1824

THE official report in 1910 of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living—a commission created by the Massachusetts legislature for a thorough and impartial investigation of the pressing problem of the cost of living, and submitting its conclusions, in May, 1910, in an exhaustive pamphlet of 752 pages—was in no other respect so impressive as in the emphasis which it laid upon the extravagances and wastes of our social and political system as a main factor in the present burdensome cost of living. As the chief of all these wastes it arraigns the world's war system and the monstrous expenditures for armaments, in a special section which is reprinted in the following pages. It should produce a profound effect upon all serious minds, as the deliverance not of propagandists but of impartial scientific inquirers dealing simply with plain but startling facts.

The members of the Massachusetts Commission preparing this report were Robert Luce, chairman, Albion F. Bemis, Edward F. McSweeney, Mederic J. Laporte, and Henry Abrahams. The secretary of the Commission was Prof. F. Spencer Baldwin.

THE WASTE OF MILITARISM

FROM THE REPORT OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION ON THE COST
OF LIVING, 1910

In weighing the causes that have contributed to increase the cost of living, this commission is convinced that a most far-reaching influence in creating, fostering, and perpetuating high prices is militarism, with its incidents of war and waste and its consequences in taxation. The three great wars of the last decade and a half—the British-Boer, the Spanish-American, and the Russo-Japanese—took millions of men out of the productive activities of our civilization into the wasteful activities of warfare, diverted the energies of other millions from useful industry in shop and mill and farm, and transferred their skill and labor to the production of war equipment, material, food, and supplies for the armies in the field. This diversion of labor and capital from productive industry to waste and destruction, with the accompanying diminution of the necessities of life and an inability to supply the world's demands, inevitably resulted in an advance of the prices of the commodities of common consumption.

In addition to these conditions, and incidental to them, the mania for militarism leads nations to plunge into debt in order to create and maintain armies that may never fight and navies that may never fire a hostile shot. This mania has piled up huge financial burdens in England, Germany, France, and other foreign countries, for meeting which the best energies of their statesmen are diverted to devise new methods of taxation. In the United States, as in Europe, the exactions of militarism and its burdens of a debt that gives opportunity to use the necessity to raise revenue for selfish purposes are prime factors in the economic waste that has produced high prices. This

commission does not care to discuss the philosophy of militarism. It simply desires to show that war in all its phases is one of the most serious influences in producing present high prices.

The term "militarism" includes all that enters into the creation, organization, and preparation of armies and navies, as well as the actual warfare for which they are designed. The question of national defense, its wisdom or unwisdom, we need not discuss at this point; we are concerned only with its existence, its influence on our economic activities, its cost to the nation, and its part in bringing about the conditions now under discussion.

As showing the enormous demands that militarism makes upon resources, let us first note the comparative expenditures of the national treasury for the thirty-one years from 1879 to 1909. The figures are given both in amounts and in percentages of national revenue as follows:

Army	\$2,465,096,479 = 20.2 per cent
Navy	1,456,795,867 = 11.9 per cent
Pensions	3,499,883,832 = 28.7 per cent
Interest	1,309,026,795 = 10.7 per cent
Total	<u>\$12,210,499,778 = 71.5 per cent</u>

The balance of the national income for those thirty-one years, amounting to \$3,479,696,805, or 28.5 per cent of the whole, was spent upon the civil administration of national affairs, Indians, legislation, law, justice, customs service, and all other miscellaneous activities of the nation.

Thus during this period 71.5 per cent of the nation's income, almost three dollars out of every four of revenue, was spent on the destructive agencies of war, for the interest paid on the debts contracted for warlike purposes, and in pensions to the victims of war,—the army of surviving economic inefficients created by war.

The national debt of the United States is a monument to our past wars, and is as follows:

National Debt of the United States, November 1, 1909

Debt bearing interest	\$913,317,490.00
Debt interest ceased	2,686,895.26
Debt non-interest-bearing	379,143,046.78
Total	\$1,295,147,432.04
Treasury notes and other paper currency, secured by cash in the treasury, which may be regarded rather as a public con- venience than a public debt	\$1,366,277,869.00

Eliminating the nominal debt indicated by notes and paper currency in circulation, with other credits, and assuming the population of the United States to be 94,000,000, the per capita debt would amount to almost exactly \$10.00.

In addition, there are debts of the states, counties, and cities of the country, about 25 per cent at least of which may be assumed to have been the contribution of the states to national militarism, the rest of the debt being supposedly for improvements representing economic values. These debts represent an average per capita of \$22.40, which, added to the national per capita, yields a total debt of \$36.80 per capita. The table follows:

Indebtedness of Cities, Counties, and States by Groups of States

Group	Indebtedness	Per Capita
North Atlantic States	\$946,604,780	\$37.28
South Atlantic States	159,834,215	22.10
North Central States	468,862,168	14.17
South Central States	173,776,068	16.14
Western Division States	115,118,595	13.85
Totals	\$1,864,195,826	\$22.40

In the one hundred and twenty-six years of our national existence, besides the war of the rebellion, we have had wars with three foreign powers,—England, Mexico, and Spain. Whether or not any or all of these wars were preventable is a matter of merely academic interest at this time. Though they covered only six years of our national life, and the rebellion

four, these ten years were responsible for our huge debts. It is worth recalling that during the life of the republic we have spent for all purposes the sum of \$21,518,871,351, and of this amount \$16,567,677,135 was devoted to militarism and its incidents and only \$4,951,194,216 to the activities of peace. It is particularly worthy of note that the money spent on militarism by this republic in the one hundred and twenty-six years of its political life, \$16,567,677,135, exceeds the gold production of the world since the discovery of America—thirteen and a half billions of dollars—by three billions. These figures are impressive.

In spite of our natural strategic advantages, our continental isolation, and practical economic independence, the United States has multiplied its expenditures for national defense two hundred times during a period when our population has increased only twenty-two times and our coast line lengthened three times. Our danger from attack has not increased; our wealth, numbers, and other circumstances would imply that it has diminished; and yet we are spending more for defense than France, only about \$36,000,000 annually less than Germany, and \$66,000,000 less than England,—countries lying at the very heart of militarism, and all dependent on imports for part of their food supplies.

We cannot, in view of these considerations, escape the fact that militarism is a cause of enormous waste in this age. Its world-wide existence and character make it the most difficult of all problems to solve, just as the logic upon which its existence is based is the most intractable to combat and controvert. National honor and safety are the catchwords of a system that is bleeding the world to death; the former, shadowy though it may be, is more in evidence abroad than at home; and so far in the life of the republic the latter has been jeopardized more frequently by our inhabitants than by foreign foes. Nevertheless, the bogey of foreign aggression and invasion is periodically invoked to bolster up the system of militarism whenever it appears to need support and whenever the appropriations do

not meet the desires of those whose economic existence depends upon the production of the instrumentalities of war and waste.

The following figures, covering the period from 1793 to date, one hundred and seventeen years, incomplete as they are, make an impressive exhibit of the waste of life and treasure that militarism has brought to civilization:

Wars and their Cost

Dates	Countries engaged	Cost	Loss of Life	Armies in the Field
1793-1815	England and France	\$6,250,000,000	1,900,000	3,000,000
1812-1815	France and Russia	450,625,000		1,500,000
1828 . . .	Russia and Turkey	100,000,000	120,000	
1830-1840	Spain and Portugal (civil war) . . .	250,000,000	160,000	300,000
1830-1847	France and Algeria	190,000,000	110,000	150,000
1848 . . .	Revolts in Europe	50,000,000	60,000	
1845 . . .	United States and Mexico		10,000	90,100
1854-1856 .	England	371,000,000	609,797	1,460,500
	France	332,000,000		
	Sardinia and Turkey	128,000,000		
	Austria	68,600,000		
1859 . . .	Russia	800,000,000	24,000	128,000
	France	75,000,000		
	Austria	127,000,000		
	Italy	51,000,000		
1861-1865	The rebellion	5,000,000,000	294,400 200,000	2,041,600 750,000
1864 . . .	Denmark, Prussia, and Austria . . .	36,000,000		
1866 . . .	Prussia and Austria	330,000,000	57,000	639,000
1864-1870	Brazil, Argentine, and Paraguay . . .	240,000,000	330,000	
1865-1866	France and Mexico	65,000,000	65,000	100,000
1870-1871 .	France	1,580,000,000	311,000	1,713,000
	Germany	954,400,000		
1876-1877 .	Russia	806,547,489	180,000	1,500,000
	Turkey	403,273,745		
1898 . . .	Spain and the United States	1,165,000,000	20,000	300,000
1900-1901	Transvaal Republic and England . . .	1,000,100,000	91,000	400,000
1904-1905	Russia and Japan	2,500,000,000	555,900	2,500,000
Expense of wars, 1793-1860			\$9,243,225,000	
Expense of wars, 1861-1910			14,080,321,240	
Total			\$23,323,546,240	
Loss of life, military service			5,098,097	
Armies in the field			16,822,200	

The figures are estimates, but estimates by trained scholars and statisticians; and they can, after all, represent only a small part of the loss of life and treasure.

The cost of the Napoleonic invasion of Russia in 1812, and the subsequent wars which ended in the overthrow of the Emperor of the French, are from figures given by Jean S. Bloch, and cover only the actual loans, issues of paper "assignats" to meet military expenses, and the English subsidies paid to Russia. The destruction of Moscow and the enormous waste in other directions are not calculated.

The waste and the loss which the Napoleonic era, including the French revolutionary, directory, and consular wars, inflicted on Italy, the Netherlands, the German kingdoms and principalities, Spain, Portugal, and Egypt have not been estimated; but economically, financially, and humanly they must have been enormous. Leroy Beaulieu states that the age of the revolution and the empire cost France \$4,200,000,000; and up to the year 1799 her loss of men amounted to 1,500,000.

When the French Revolution became successful, the enormous public debt of France, in the neighborhood of a billion dollars, was wiped off the slate, ruining thousands who had invested in good faith, counting on the permanency of the French monarchy. The new rulers were wasteful and careless, and ruined trade and commerce for a time by war and financial ignorance. Napoleon brought order out of chaos, but his ceaseless warfare piled up debts. The public debt kept on increasing by leaps and bounds, mainly through militarism and war. Thus the French national public debt was, in:

1852	\$1,103,200,000
1871	2,490,800,000
1876	3,981,800,000
1895	5,193,600,000
1906	5,665,134,825

It is worthy of remark that at the outbreak of the French Revolution France was paying out 80 per cent of her income

for military purposes and the debts contracted for wars. The French and Indian seven years' war cost France \$472,000,000, and the war of American independence, waged for the colonies and against England, cost nearly as much, and eventually destroyed the monarchy.

The enormous national debt of England has been piled up almost exclusively by the constant wars, great and small, in which she has been engaged. The growth of this debt from its inception to date is interesting economically; it began, in England, practically with the establishment of a standing army of a permanent character. The following short table of English wars and debts is significant:

1689. After expulsion of James II	\$5,270,000
1713. After War of Spanish Succession	268,400,000
1743. After War of Austrian Succession	390,000,000
1756. After French and Indian War	697,500,000
1783. After American Revolution	1,190,000,000
1793. After ten years of peace	1,140,000,000
1816. After Napoleonic wars	4,380,000,000

The fact that in 1814 France was paying a sum of only \$12,600,000 per annum in interest on her debt, while England was paying \$160,000,000, is interesting not only as showing a higher financial skill by Napoleon in conducting his operations, but also as throwing a great light on the losses that must have come to the countries defeated and conquered by Napoleon, who made the conquered, where possible, pay the expenses and armies of the conqueror. Europe was destroying her resources and population; England was saved from bankruptcy by having the world on which to draw.

In 1800, while the ordinary administrative civil expenditures of this republic amounted to only \$1,330,000, the expenditures for pensions and naval and military purposes reached the sum of \$9,470,000. The country's debt in 1812 was about \$45,200,000, but by the time the war with England closed it had been run up to \$127,300,000. The country then settled down to the ways

of peace, industry, and trade in a national sense, our only trouble being petty Indian outbreaks, so that by the time of the Mexican war the national debt had been paid off.

The expenses of the government have since been constantly increasing; but although the extension of territorial settlement and the increase of population would have entailed increased expenses in the administration of public affairs, the largest item of expense has always been for military affairs, army and navy. The war of the rebellion, with its waste and loss, may have been preventable; we are to look at that tremendous contest simply from its economic side. Its effects on every phase of American life were far-reaching, and on none so impressive as on the economic side. Five years after its close the United States, in 1870, as a result of it, was paying out in interest charges alone twice as much as the whole cost of the government in 1860. Prior to the rebellion the budget of the army and navy amounted to \$27,980,000, and, though the vast armies that had carried on the struggle had vanished and were absorbed into civil life, the army and navy in 1870 cost the country \$79,430,000.

The following table of the indebtedness of the principal European countries and their dependencies is an impressive showing of the enormous capital taken from productive industry and the work of civilization and wasted in death and destruction. The debt thus piled up for war and waste remains a burden on the life of the world, — a burden calling every year for a huge interest payment of more than a billion dollars taken from the earnings of the nations. This is supplemented annually by many other billions to maintain huge armies and navies of men taken from industry, who are organized, trained, and maintained for the day when they will again be hurled at each other, to duplicate the destruction of the past and pile up new and heavier burdens upon the thrift and industry of the world.

*Indebtedness of Nations, with Amount of Interest Payments,
Computed up to the Year 1906*

Country	National Debt	Annual Interest Payments
Austria-Hungary	\$1,092,863,255	\$48,214,794
Belgium	621,640,286	24,925,694
Denmark	64,231,713	2,197,120
France	5,655,134,825	237,855,497
French Algiers	6,323,838	737,440
German Empire	855,963,454	30,358,300
German States	2,957,356,846	120,537,100
Netherlands	458,069,211	14,718,505
Portugal	864,701,627	21,369,000
Roumania	278,249,239	16,086,604
Russia	4,038,199,722	172,385,884
Russia, Finland	27,073,900	1,205,734
Switzerland	19,787,648	1,037,642
Turkey	458,603,213	9,499,450
United Kingdom	3,839,620,745	150,295,210
British colonies	612,510,084	22,802,418
Spain	1,899,265,995	69,256,706
Italy	2,767,911,940	190,803,281
Totals	\$26,517,504,541	\$1,134,296,179

The table of prices computed by Professor Roland P. Falkner for the Aldrich report shows that the prices of food during the Mexican War period jumped about 8 per cent. During the Crimean War, when the wheat and grain markets of Russia were closed and exportation except by land practically stopped, food prices in 1853 went up 14 per cent and in 1854 20 per cent above those of 1852, while cloths and clothing advanced about 12 per cent.

In 1855 and 1856 the advance in food prices over 1852 was 25 per cent; and in 1857, a year of panic and industrial and business disturbance, prices rose again to 30 per cent above the year preceding the Crimean War. Prices dropped back again in 1858 and in 1859, but never to the 1852 standard. The level in 1860 was the normal, below which the 1861 prices dropped 5 per cent. Then came the war of the rebellion, with its waste, the sealing up of the South and its elimination from

the economic life of the country, — an era of vast borrowings and expenditures for purposes and materials that meant economic waste on a huge scale, disturbance of agriculture and destruction of the American marine and foreign commerce, the removal from all economic production of large armies of men, and the displacement of other armies of workers to supply their needs. To these were added the practical disappearance of gold as a circulating medium and the introduction of a depreciated currency. These evils were capped by a stoppage of immigration and a cessation of the opening up and productive settlement of our western lands.

Relatively to 1860, the normal year, the advances of prices of food and clothing were :

Year	Food	Clothing	Year	Food	Clothing
1862	10.4	24.1	1867	63.9	79.9
1863	33.0	91.6	1868	64.2	46.8
1864	65.8	160.7	1869	62.9	47.5
1865	116.5	199.2	1870	53.8	39.4
1866	73.6	126.6	1871	69.3	33.3

In those years food products were bought, sold, and paid for in the depreciated currency of the day.

In 1879, 1885, and 1886 food prices dropped below the normal of 1860, and clothing, except in 1880, was cheaper down to 1891 than before the war; but food prices never went back to ante-bellum rates. Industrial America developed more rapidly than pastoral and agricultural America during the seventies and eighties.

In 1900 Professor Falkner prepared tables of wholesale prices, based on the average of the nine quarterly prices from January, 1890, to January, 1892, which were used as the normal. The period covered was from January, 1890, to July, 1899, practically a period of peace, accompanied by a great agricultural and grain-growing development; a gradual decay or restriction of cattle ranching, incident to the occupation of homesteads by settlers; and the economic organization of the

packing and canning business controlling the meat supplies. The prices of food, clothing, fuel, and building materials during this decade show in wholesale prices a fairly level condition. The highest prices of foods were in April, 1891, when they were 4.8 per cent above normal; the lowest in July, 1896, when they were 25 per cent below normal, — doubtless the result of great harvests at home and abroad, and of the slow recovery from the industrial depression that had prevailed for several years. In 1896 was reached substantially the low limit of the recession of prices that began in 1873. In 1897 the upward tendency of prices began, as is shown elsewhere in this report. This tendency took on new momentum when the Spanish-American War broke out in the following year. High-price conditions were stimulated by the scarcity and artificial demand induced by that outbreak and by the British-Boer and Russo-Japanese conflicts, which came in rapid succession.

The fact that we are expending, during this fiscal year, seventy-two per cent of our aggregate revenue in preparing for war and on account of past wars, leaving only twenty-eight per cent of our revenue available to meet all other governmental expenditures, including internal improvements, the erection of public buildings, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and the conservation of our natural resources, is to my mind appalling. It should arrest the attention of the American people, and not only cause them to demand a decrease in these unnecessary war expenditures, but also prompt them to aid in every way possible in the creation of a public sentiment that would favor the organization of an international federation whose decisions and action in the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations would be recognized and accepted as the final determination thereof. If this were done, it would not necessarily mean the entire abandonment of armies and navies, but it would so far remove the possibility of international wars as to make unnecessary the expenditure of the stupendous sums which are now being collected from the people in the form of taxes and expended for the purpose of maintaining armed peace.

The money expended for this purpose is not the only measure of the cost of armed peace. Think for a moment of what the American people have lost during the past eight years in consequence of the increased expenditure of more than a billion dollars during that time for the purpose of preparing for war in order that war may be prevented. The most enthusiastic advocates of river and harbor improvements do not estimate that the cost of these improvements would exceed \$500,000,000, only half the amount which we have collected in taxes from the people and expended in war preparation during the last eight years in excess of the amount expended for the same purpose during the eight years preceding 1898. The other half of this enormous increase might well have been expended in other directions which would have contributed to the permanent advancement of the vast and varied interests of ninety millions of people.

— *From an Address by Hon. James A. Tawney, May 5, 1909.*

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

(Formerly the International School of Peace)

PAMPHLET SERIES

April, 1911

- No. 1. Part I. THE RESULTS OF THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES AND THE DEMANDS UPON THE THIRD CONFERENCE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part II. SIR EDWARD GREY ON UNION FOR WORLD PEACE. Speech in House of Commons, March 13, 1911
Part III. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION. By EDWIN GINN
Part IV. THE INTERNATIONAL DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN. By EDWIN D. MEAD

July, 1911

- No. 2. Part I. See No. 6, Part V
Part II. SOME SUPPOSED JUST CAUSES OF WAR. By Hon. JACKSON H. RALSTON
Part III. SYNDICATES FOR WAR. London Correspondence of the *New York Evening Post*

October, 1911

- No. 3. Part I. WHY THE ARBITRATION TREATIES SHOULD STAND. Prepared by DENYS P. MYERS
Part II. WAR NOT INEVITABLE. By Hon. JOHN W. FOSTER
Part III. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT AND THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION. By Dr. CHRISTIAN L. LANGE
Part IV. CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE FOR ARBITRATION
Part V. THE MISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE. By Hon. DAVID J. BREWER

January, 1912

- No. 4. Part I. CONCERNING SEA POWER. By DAVID STARR JORDAN
Part II. HEROES OF PEACE. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part III. INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR ARMIES AND NAVIES. By WILLIAM C. GANNETT

April, 1912

- No. 5. Part I. THE DRAIN OF ARMAMENTS. By ARTHUR W. ALLEN
Part II. THE TRUTH ABOUT JAPAN. By JOHN H. DE FOREST
Part III. THE COSMIC ROOTS OF LOVE. By HENRY M. SIMMONS
Part IV. WORLD SCOUTS. By ALBERT JAY NOCK
Part V. THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By CHARLES F. DOLE

July, 1912

- No. 6. Part I. THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION: ITS PRESENT ACTIVITIES
Part II. NEUTRALIZATION: AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY. By ERVING WINSLOW
Part III. WILLIAM T. STEAD AND HIS PEACE MESSAGE. By JAMES A. MACDONALD
Part IV. EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP. By LUCIA AMES MEAD
Part V. REVISED LIST OF ARBITRATION TREATIES. Compiled by DENYS P. MYERS

October, 1912

- No. 7. Part I. HEROES OF THE SEA. By W. M. THACKERAY
Part II. THE FORCES THAT MAKE FOR PEACE. By Hon. WILLIAM J. BRYAN
Part III. FOREIGN MISSIONS AND WORLD PEACE. By SAMUEL B. CAPEN
Part IV. THE LITERATURE OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT. By EDWIN D. MEAD
Part V. THE WASTE OF MILITARISM. From the Report of the Massachusetts Commission on the Cost of Living

Single copies free. Price in quantities, \$3.00 per hundred copies

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

29a Beacon Street - - - - - Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY

Edited by EDWIN D. MEAD

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

CLOTH BOUND

ADDRESSES ON WAR. By CHARLES SUMNER. 8vo, xxvii+321 pages. Postpaid	\$0.60
AMERICAN ADDRESSES AT THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xlviii+217 pages. Postpaid	1.65
DISCOURSES ON WAR. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. 8vo, lxi+229 pages. Postpaid	.60
THE ETHICS OF FORCE. By H. E. WARNER. 8vo, v+126 pages. Postpaid	.55
THE FIRST BOOK OF WORLD LAW. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, v+308 pages. Postpaid	1.65
FISHERIES ARBITRATION ARGUMENT OF ELIHU ROOT. Edited, with Introduction and Appendix, by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, cli+523 pages. Postpaid	3.50
THE FUTURE OF WAR. By JEAN DE BLOCH. 8vo, lxxix+380 pages. Postpaid	.65
THE GREAT DESIGN OF HENRY IV. With Introduction by EDWIN D. MEAD. 8vo, xxi+91 pages. Postpaid	.55
INTERNATIONAL ARBITRAL LAW AND PROCEDURE. By JACKSON H. RALSTON. 8vo, xix+352 pages. Postpaid	2.20
INTER-RACIAL PROBLEMS. Papers communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Quarto, xvi+485 pages. Postpaid	2.40
MOHONK ADDRESSES. By EDWARD EVERETT HALE and DAVID J. BREWER. 8vo, xxviii+150 pages. Postpaid	1.00
THE MORAL DAMAGE OF WAR. By WALTER WALSE. 8vo, xlii+462 pages. Postpaid	.90
PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL UNIONS. By PAUL S. REINSCH. 8vo, viii+189 pages. Postpaid	1.65
SIR RANDAL CREMER. By HOWARD EVANS. 8vo, 356 pages. Postpaid	1.40
TEXTS OF THE PEACE CONFERENCES AT THE HAGUE, 1899 and 1907. Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. 8vo, xxxiv+447 pages. Postpaid	2.20
THE TWO HAGUE CONFERENCES. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 8vo, xiv+516 pages. Postpaid	1.65
WAR INCONSISTENT WITH THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. By DAVID LOW DODGE. 8vo, xxiv+168 pages. Postpaid	.60
WORLD ORGANIZATION. By RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. 8vo, vi+172 pages. Postpaid	.60

PAPER BOUND

BETHINK YOURSELVES! By LEO TOLSTOI. 6½ x 4½ in., 50 pages. Postpaid	\$0.10
THE BLOOD OF THE NATION. By DAVID STARR JORDAN. 6½ x 4½ in., 82 pages. Postpaid	.15
THE DUEL BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 76 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE KING'S EASTER. By HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD. 7½ x 5 in., 16 pages. Postpaid	.10
A LEAGUE OF PEACE. By ANDREW CARNEGIE. 6½ x 4½ in., 47 pages. Postpaid	.10
ORGANIZE THE WORLD. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 7½ x 5½ in., 36 pages. Postpaid	.10
PATRIOTISM AND THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM. By LUCIA AMES MEAD. 6½ x 4½ in., 125 pages. Postpaid	.20
THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 132 pages. Postpaid	.20
WAR SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS. By CHARLES SUMNER. 7½ x 5½ in., 107 pages. Postpaid	.20

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



109 633

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

